



Parks People and Change

Ethnic diversity and its
significance for parks,
recreation and open space
conservation in the
San Francisco Bay Area

prepared by the
BAY AREA OPEN SPACE COUNCIL
September 2004

Publication Information

This report has been prepared by the Bay Area Open Space Council as part of an ongoing initiative to (1) improve the quality of services provided by park agencies and land conservation organizations in the context of an increasingly diverse population, and (2) expand the active participation of and leadership by people of color in the open space conservation and recreation communities.

The complete report can be viewed or downloaded at www.openspacecouncil.org. Additional information relevant to this report may be published from time to time on this website. For questions about the study, please contact John Woodbury, at john@openspacecouncil.org

(c) 2004. Bay Area Open Space Council. All rights reserved.

ABOUT THE BAY AREA OPEN SPACE COUNCIL

Initiated in 1991, the Council is a unique collaboration of over 50 public agencies and land conservation and trail organizations. Members of the Council are responsible for the conservation, preservation, management and enjoyment of natural, wild, agricultural and recreational lands throughout the nine-county San Francisco Bay Area.

The mission of the Council is to permanently preserve and manage two million acres of parks, trails, agricultural lands and natural habitats of the San Francisco Bay Area through public and non-profit efforts.

Five strategies guide the work of the Council:

- o Protect resources through regional partnership
- o Strengthen regional capacity
- o Build bridges to non-traditional allies
- o Research issues of common concern
- o Improve conservation tools and practices



BAY AREA OPEN SPACE COUNCIL
631 Howard Street, Suite 500, SF, CA 94105

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	5
II. Population Projections	7
III. Ethnicity, Culture and Outdoor Recreation: A Literature Review	11
IV. Park and Recreation Activity Preferences in California and the Bay Area	15
General Park Usage	15
Family, Friends and Picnics	15
Different Ways of Walking	16
Appreciating Natural Areas	18
Camping	19
Sports and Hobbies	21
Special Activities	23
Travel Distance and Access	24
Sources of Information	25
V. Attitudes Towards Parks and Open Space in California and the Bay Area	27
Park Users Compared to Non-Park Users	27
Interest in Preserving Nature	27
Interest in Recreation	29
Wild or Improved ?	35
Interest in Water Quality and Pollution	35
Attitudes Toward Maintenance and Operations	36
Willingness to Tax and Spend on Parks and Open Space	38
VI. Findings and Recommendations for Park Agencies and Land Conservation Organizations	43
Bibliography	47
Appendices	49

Appendices

A.	BAOSC (2003-4) Park User Survey Results	51
B.	Observations of Three Sonoma County Parks	55
C.	Observations of Two Napa County Parks	59
D.	Observations of Three East Bay Parks	63
E.	National Survey on Recreation and the Environment--Bay Area Results	67

I. Introduction

Change has been the norm for the Bay Area environment for more than two centuries, and change will define our future.

The arrival of Juan Bautista de Anza in 1775 marked the end of 10,000 years of modest native American management of the Bay Area ecosystem. In short order, cattle and horses were introduced, native grasslands were replaced with European invasives, and the traditional hunting and gathering social order gave way to extractive industries and intensive agriculture. Change accelerated when the gold rush attracted a tidal wave of new immigrants: towns and farms spread across the valley floors; rivers were dammed and diverted; and every piece of land was parcelized with clearly defined ownership.

The conservation movement was born in the midst of this change. Even as the new immigrants were busily reshaping the world around them, they were also falling in love with it. The Bay Area has a seductive beauty, and it is hard to live here and remain immune to the grass-covered, Oak studded hills, the cool and damp redwood forests, and the sweeping vistas.

Early conservation efforts were driven by a desire to set aside places that would serve as museum pieces for an idealized natural order, or at least as outdoor playgrounds separate from the workaday world.

Today, a more complex conservation perspective is emerging in which nature is not separate from people. In this more complex view, successful stewardship of the Bay Area's natural

resources depends on the understanding and support of its people now and in the future. People are both the cause for most of the environmental destruction in our region, and the key to what gets preserved.

This more complex interactive view of people and place is evolving at the same time as the people are again changing. The diversity of the region's populace is well documented, and demographic research has made it clear this diversity is increasing. Many observers have also noted that today's land managers and conservationists don't even come close to reflecting this diversity.

Most of today's landowners, managers and conservation advocates are white, well-educated, and economically well-off. Their experiences are quite different from the majority of those now living in the region.

The conservationist John Muir consciously and effectively adopted the strategy of protecting the Sierra Nevada range by showing it to people. By experiencing it first-hand, he was convinced the new European immigrants spreading across the American continent would come to love the Sierra as he did, and want to save it. His strategy of outreach and education helped foster a widely-adopted ethic of conservation and a century of achievements.

If John Muir's belief that passion for conservation comes from seeing, feeling and breathing nature, then future success in

conserving the Bay Area landscape lies with those who are today experiencing our parks, trails, preserves and working landscapes.

This report is an attempt to understand the implications of ethnic and cultural change for parks and the preservation of open space in the San Francisco Bay Area. It draws from and compares a variety of sources.

Section II sets the stage by presenting the most recent population projections for the state, the region, and each county.

This is followed in Section III by a review of the national literature on the relationship between culture, ethnicity and outdoor recreation. This review is by no means exhaustive. The purpose here is to show the kinds of data that are available and range of thought on the topic.

Section IV analyzes of outdoor recreation patterns in California and the San Francisco Bay Area based on national and local surveys, data collected by local park agencies, and surveys of park users conducted by the Bay Area Open Space Council.

Section V reviews surveys and studies that consider attitudes toward parks, recreation and open space, and how they may vary by ethnicity.

Building on the findings of the first three sections, Section VI presents recommendations for how park agencies and the land conservation community can better serve the increasingly diverse Bay Area population and broaden support for preserving open space resources.



Photo by John Woodbury

Kids playing at Bodega Dunes

Before going further, however, it is important to remember that commonly used definitions for describing race, ethnicity and culture are inconsistent and problematic. Different sources use different and generally undefined terminology. Most surveys rely on respondents to self-identify their ethnicity, sometimes with open-ended questions and sometimes with preselected categories. In comparing results from different studies, there is thus to some degree an unavoidable mixing of apples and oranges.

When reporting census-based data, census terminology is used. Elsewhere, this report uses terminology which hopefully comes closest to conveying the concept of cultural identities, rather than racial categories.

II. Population Projections

It's no secret that California's population will continue to grow. While the Bay Area's growth rate is expected to be slower than California as a whole, the region's population will still swell massively (148% between 2000 and 2050, as compared to 161% for the State).

The growth is not expected to occur evenly throughout the nine-county area, however. San Francisco and Marin counties, in fact, are predicted to lose population, the result of assumed continued declines in household sizes combined with a relatively stable housing stock.

At the other end of the scale is Solano county, which is predicted to more than double in population, followed by Contra Costa, Napa, Sonoma, and Alameda, all of which will increase more than 50 percent. Santa Clara County, which is predicted to increase its population to "only" 138 percent of its current level, will still see over 600,000 more people. In absolute terms, this is more growth than all Bay Area counties except for Alameda and Contra Costa.

The raw numbers only tell part of the story. Just as important, and a key reason for this report, is the changing composition of the population.

Those who are classified by the U.S. Census as non-Hispanic white in 2000 made up 47% of California's

population, and 50% of the Bay Area's. By 2050 there will be fewer non-Hispanic whites in both absolute and relative terms, representing only 23% of the State, and 27% of the Bay Area.

Bay Area and California Population Projections

	Total Population			Change
	2000	2020	2050	2000-2050
Alameda	1,451,109	1,864,145	2,315,045	160%
Contra Costa	954,504	1,327,081	1,848,177	194%
Marin	248,473	251,260	225,127	91%
Napa	124,945	165,946	221,466	177%
San Francisco	781,174	820,545	706,192	90%
San Mateo	710,493	786,740	826,342	116%
Santa Clara	1,691,183	2,006,992	2,325,538	138%
Solano	396,784	555,264	830,830	209%
Sonoma	461,347	602,783	796,792	173%
Bay Area	6,820,012	8,380,756	10,095,509	148%
California	34,043,198	43,851,741	54,777,700	161%

Source: (25) State of California Department of Finance

Bay Area and California Population Projections By Ethnicity

	White			Hispanic			Asian			Black		
	2000	2020	2050	2000	2020	2050	2000	2020	2050	2000	2020	2050
Alameda	594,970	455,827	346,969	279,521	523,434	957,088	306,973	587,284	694,846	212,061	201,217	194,229
	41%	24%	15%	19%	28%	41%	21%	32%	30%	15%	11%	8%
Contra Costa	555,747	478,508	408,382	171,239	411,890	733,260	106,705	236,060	405,406	88,534	135,078	196,766
	58%	36%	22%	18%	31%	40%	11%	18%	22%	9%	10%	11%
Marin	196,494	176,564	127,135	27,691	40,842	54,205	11,210	17,442	25,541	7,183	7,181	6,286
	79%	70%	56%	11%	16%	24%	5%	7%	11%	3%	3%	3%
Napa	86,411	84,068	76,472	29,940	60,883	107,849	3,814	8,848	14,941	1,637	4,529	9,535
	69%	51%	35%	24%	37%	49%	3%	5%	7%	1%	3%	4%
San Francisco	347,398	365,889	299,562	109,853	120,872	111,291	243,060	257,756	234,807	58,083	47,119	32,319
	44%	45%	42%	14%	15%	16%	31%	31%	33%	7%	6%	5%
San Mateo	358,020	333,318	280,795	155,905	228,566	314,810	144,369	171,032	175,873	24,056	16,011	13,739
	50%	42%	34%	22%	29%	38%	20%	22%	21%	3%	2%	2%
Santa Clara	755,102	724,491	636,867	409,168	608,542	999,052	435,720	567,670	565,935	45,330	43,526	50,191
	45%	36%	27%	24%	30%	43%	26%	28%	24%	3%	2%	2%
Solano	197,465	137,951	136,065	69,705	184,798	386,836	50,353	88,863	113,933	58,749	96,798	116,554
	50%	25%	16%	18%	33%	47%	13%	16%	14%	15%	17%	14%
Sonoma	345,095	390,924	421,596	80,742	139,402	250,692	14,687	32,007	54,688	6,439	11,594	18,136
	75%	65%	53%	18%	23%	31%	3%	5%	7%	1%	2%	2%
Bay Area	3,436,706	3,147,543	2,733,845	1,333,766	2,319,231	3,915,086	1,316,892	1,966,964	2,285,972	502,073	563,054	637,755
	50%	38%	27%	20%	28%	39%	19%	23%	23%	7%	7%	6%
California	16,047,989	14,757,146	12,755,395	11,082,985	18,877,590	29,386,940	3,746,292	5,565,651	6,617,904	2,222,816	2,935,929	3,500,358
	47%	34%	23%	33%	43%	54%	11%	13%	12%	7%	7%	6%

Source: (25) State of California Department of Finance

By contrast, Hispanics in 2000 constituted 33% of the State's population, and 20% of the Bay Area's, yet by 2050, 54% of all Californians, and 39% of all those in the Bay Area will be hispanic.

Those classified as Asian will also increase substantially,

though their relative share of the population will only increase 1% statewide and 4% regionally. Lastly, the black population will also increase somewhat, even though their relative share of the population will decline slightly both statewide and regionally, going from 7 to 6 percent of the population.

This dramatic change in ethnic diversity will have interesting and varied impacts on other demographic factors. For example, many observers have noted that the American population is aging. This has significant implications for outdoor recreation patterns, propensity to vote and participate in civic affairs, and willingness to support taxes and government programs.

Currently, the most elderly persons are the most likely to vote, and the least likely to be willing to increase taxes. They are also overwhelmingly white. With this in mind, consider the case of Sonoma county. The percentage of the population over 70 years of age in 2000 was 10 percent. This is projected to increase further, such that by 2050 the over-70 group will make

up 15% of the population. However, while in 2000 this age group was 93% white, by 2050 this is projected to decline to 63%. In 2000, only 4% of the over-70 group was Hispanic; in 2050 this group will be 20% Hispanic.

A similar pattern can be seen in the 40-69 age group. The non-white share of this age group will increase nearly three-fold, from 13 to 35%.

Sonoma County is currently the second least ethnically diverse county in the Bay Area, and is projected to remain so in 2050. Even here, however, the rate of ethnic diversification will likely be profound, with the rate of change magnified among the future elderly.

Sonoma County Population Projections By Age and Ethnicity 2000-2050

Age	Percentage of total Population 2000					Percentage of total Population 2050				
	Total	White	Hispanic	Asian	Black	Total	White	Hispanic	Asian	Black
Under 20	27%	17%	7%	<1%	<1%	24%	10%	10%	1%	<1%
21-39	27%	18%	7%	1%	<1%	26%	13%	9%	2%	<1%
40-69	36%	31%	3%	1%	<1%	36%	21%	10%	2%	<1%
70 +	10%	9%	<1%	<1%	<1%	15%	9%	3%	2%	<1%
Composition of Each Age Category										
Under 20		64%	26%	3%	2%		44%	43%	6%	2%
21-39		66%	25%	4%	1%		50%	34%	6%	2%
40-69		84%	9%	3%	1%		57%	27%	7%	2%
70+		93%	4%	2%	1%		63%	20%	10%	2%

Source: (25) State of California Department of Finance

Overall, the Bay Area is looking at a future in which the politically dominant WOOFs (Well Off Older Folks) will no longer be almost exclusively white. The diversity we see today among younger people will naturally progress into the ranks of the elderly.

III. Ethnicity, Culture & Recreation: A Literature Review

Park and recreation managers and social scientists began formal studies of the ethnicity and cultural backgrounds of their users—and non-users—nearly 50 years ago. Three general topics have characterized the research: underparticipation and underutilization, outdoor recreational style, and processes of cultural change. The early studies were framed with questions like “why don’t African Americans take part in the same outdoor recreational activities, or to the same degree of frequency, as white Americans? Two theoretical perspectives characterized the studies of the 1960’s and 1970’s. One school of thought proposed that differences in recreational activity were primarily a function of income and education, while the other held that perceived variances were the result of some vaguely defined cultural aspect of race or ethnicity.

When the early studies came up with inconclusive and often contradictory conclusions, social scientists developed a variety of new and more complicated theories and avenues of research. Correlations between income and recreational patterns, for example, were adjusted for various opportunity or access factors, such as physical proximity of people to parks, the quality of parks, the availability of transportation, and cost. Cultural explanations were expanded to consider the effect of discrimination, variations between ethnic groups, regional and rural/urban distinctions, and differences between newer immigrants and longer-term residents.

In the process, the Anglo-conformity assimilation model which flavored early studies was largely abandoned. This model held that America is a melting pot where all immigrants and ethnic groups over time acquire similar mainstream values and behaviors. In its place some researchers have proposed a theory of selective

acculturation, suggesting that while ethnic groups will adopt middle-class white American cultural characteristics for some purposes (eg, employment), their core cultural values will be maintained and expressed when it comes to recreation and leisure activities (Gramann 1996). Others have suggested that as America becomes more diverse, the whole notion of acculturation is misleading: there is in fact no longer a single mainstream culture; America is a salad bowl not a melting pot.

A growing body of research over the past few decades has shown that participation rates and attitudes towards parks, nature and conservation of natural resources are strongly correlated to income, education, age, gender, and sometimes ethnicity. The research also shows that differences within ethnic groups, as commonly defined, are at least as remarkable as differences between those groups. This is hardly surprising. Those classified as Hispanics, for example, may have lived in the United States for generations or a few short days or years, and either they or their ancestors may have come from any of dozens of nations, regions and cultural backgrounds. Similarly, those with a mixed ethnic heritage are typically classified as belonging to the non-white classification, regardless of the actual circumstances of their family background.

Today, there is little agreement at the theoretical level about the dynamics of culture, ethnicity, recreational activity and attitudes about recreation, parks and natural resource conservation. Numerous correlations have been identified, but statistical attempts to identify causal factors and effects have not been very satisfactory.

The serious theoretical shortcomings with using ethnicity to *explain* participation rates and attitudes raises the obvious question of whether it makes sense to even use ethnicity as a lens for study and evaluation. Nonetheless, there are at least three reasons why it is important to consider ethnicity:

- (1) Racism and discrimination have been and continues to be a factor in American life, both at the institutional and individual level. One step in overcoming the effects of racism and discrimination is to acknowledge expressed differences in behavior and interests by different ethnic groups.
- (2) Even if they do not explain causality, correlations between socioeconomic factors and behavior and interests can be useful tools for resource allocation decisions. Race, ethnicity and class are highly interrelated, but one doesn't have to be able to separate out the relative causal importance of each factor to use these distinctions to provide more equity in public investments and the delivery of services.
- (3) Nearly all Americans readily self-identify themselves as belonging to a particular race or ethnic group. The successful protection of habitat, natural resources, and other park and open space lands depends on participation and loyalty to this goal by as many segments of the population as possible. Success is hampered whenever any grouping of people is either excluded or absent.

Setting aside the debate about the reasons for the differences, the national social science literature offers a variety of generalizations about recreational activities, attitudes and demographic factors:

- o Adult recreational patterns are based on what is learned while young and from one's peers.

- o Most outdoor recreation participation occurs close to home.

- o The proportion of people of color engaged in outdoor recreation declines with distance from home.

- o Time constraints are the most frequently mentioned reasons for why people do not engage in outdoor recreation.

- o Personal income is positively correlated with participation in most forms of outdoor recreation.

- o Income is a stronger predictor of outdoor recreation levels than sex, age, race or level of education.

- o Non-users of public parks are disproportionately female, older, non-white and have lower education and income levels.

- o Demographic groupings based on gender, age and race tend to mask the tremendous variation within those groupings.

- o Whites engage in wildland activities at a higher rate than do African Americans. Two frequently cited exceptions to this pattern are fishing and hunting.



Photo by John Woodbury

Learning to appreciate mud and nature starts at a young age.

Photo by Salvador Davila



A small family picnic at Lake Solano

- o African Americans are often reported to show less concern for conserving land, and less preference for purely natural settings and nature-oriented recreation activities, than do whites. Stated differently, African Americans are said to favor more development in recreation areas than do whites.
- o African Americans tend to stay closer to home when engaging in outdoor recreation.
- o Many people of color, but especially African Americans are concerned about the potential for discrimination and bigotry in rural America, and are thus reluctant to travel and recreate there.
- o Few African American children from low-income families

have much experience with camping.

- o African Americans resemble whites in their tendency to participate in recreational activities either as individuals or as a member of single-generation peer groups.
- o Latino parks users tend to recreate in larger social groups than whites.
- o Extended family activities are important for Latino park users.
- o Latino culture does not isolate people from the natural environment; the ideal hispanic landscape is “peopled and productive” and does not include the notion of an uninhabited wilderness.
- o Latino park users do not so much seek a “wilderness experi-



Photo by Bay Trail Project

Fishing Day at the Berkeley Marina on the Bay Trail

ence” as an opportunity to recreate in a beautiful outdoor setting with family members, and tend to prefer more developed sites that can accommodate larger groups.

- o Recent Latino immigrants are quite different from those raised in the U.S. Recreational patterns of U.S. born Latinos more closely match those of the general population than do those born in Mexico or Central America.
- o Native Americans typically recreate in much larger social groups (50-200 people) than non-hispanic whites.
- o Education of children and teens by their elders through traditional Indian recreational activities is an important purpose for Native American park use.

Family and food at Fuller Park



Photo by Suzanne Easton

General Level of Park Usage in the San Francisco Bay Area

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ethnicity</u>			
		<u>White</u>	<u>Latino</u>	<u>African American</u>	<u>Asian American</u>
How Often Do You Use a Park or Recreational Facility? (10)					
Often (2+/mth)	46%	54%	40%	17%	15%
Sometimes (1/mth)	33%	30%	40%	43%	50%
Seldom (<1/mth)	15%	10%	20%	29%	35%
Never	6%	6%	0%	11%	0%
How Often Do You Engage in Outdoor Recreational Activities? (22)					
Twice a week +	48%	55%	44%	67%	34%
About once a week	26%	21%	27%	13%	35%
A few times a month	17%	16%	14%	13%	25%
A few times a year	6%	5%	11%	0%	5%
Rarely	2%	2%	2%	7%	0%
How Often Do You Visit a Nearby Park? (18)					
Frequently	47%	44%	63%	44%	45%
Occasionally	43%	44%	35%	42%	46%
Never	10%	12%	2%	14%	9%
Have You Ever Visited a MROSD Park? (17)					
	74%	77%	64%	64%	37%
How Often Spend Leisure time at Local Parks, Recreation Areas or Beaches? (20)					
Regularly	40%		44%		
Sometimes	41%		40%		
Hardly ever	13%		10%		
Never	6%		6%		

Sources and Sample Size

(10) EBRPD (June/July 2004) sample size:	300	201	20	35	20
(18) Audubon (Nov 2000) sample size:	700	420	91	56	91
(17) MROSD (1994) sample size:	500	420	11	11	19
(20) PPIC (June 2002)	2029		~550		
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size:	500	245	100	15	95

IV. Park and Recreation Activity Preferences

GENERAL PARK USAGE

When asked a broad question about whether they use park and recreational facilities, there is little difference among respondents based on ethnicity. When asked how frequently people use parks of any variety, different surveys show different results, but overall usage by Latinos and whites does not appear to vary significantly. By contrast African Americans and Asian Americans overall seem to be less frequent users of park and outdoor recreational facilities.

In interpreting such statistics, it is very important to remember that numerous factors are highly correlated with park usage patterns, including income, education, age, and number of children. Furthermore, these factors are highly interrelated. This makes rigorous statistical analysis problematic. The data does not reveal what may be causal factors or simply accidental correlations.

It is beyond the scope of this report to provide an exhaustive review of the full range of factors which are correlated with park usage. To provide some context, however, one recent survey (EBRPD, June/July 2004) had this to say about demographic factors and how they relate to park usage:

- o Income and education are the factors with the strongest correlations with park usage; park usage rates go up with rising income and higher education level.
- o Park usage drops dramatically for those over age 65.

- o The more children in the family, the more likely to use parks (64% of those in households of 3+ children, compared to 46% for all households).
- o Homeowners tend to use parks more than renters, but not a great deal more.
- o Length of residency in the area had little effect on park usage rates.
- o Self-described liberals use parks more than self-described conservatives.
- o Democrats tend to use parks more frequently than Republicans.

FAMILY, FRIENDS AND PICNICS

It doesn't get much better than family, friends and food. Picnics and family gatherings score high across all ethnic groups as reasons for recreating outdoors.

When park users were asked for reasons why parks and open space were important, 78% said because they were places for children to play, 82% said because they were places to get together with family, and 84% said because they were places to spend time with friends (BAOSC 2003-4).

Parks with the highest diversity of park users tend to be those with extensive picnic facilities. Field observations of selected parks in the north and east bay (see Appendix) demonstrate this quite graphically.

In Napa, an old-style, well landscaped urban park designed for picnicking is crowded on weekends, and a particular draw for Latinos. Just a few miles away, a more natural regional park gets much less usage, especially in the hot summer months, and the users are predominantly white. A similar pattern repeats itself in a comparison of adjacent parks into Sonoma County.

Family, Friends and Picnics

	Total	Ethnicity			
		White	Latino	African American	Asian American
Picnicking is a High Frequency Activity (19)		68%	57%	61%	60%
Family Gathering is a High Frequency Activity (19)		79%	79%	79%	72%
Picnicking is One of Your Most Frequent Activities (22)	20%	20%	34%	19%	14%
Picnicking is Activity You Do At This Park (29)	60%	54%	71%	79%	53%
Parks and Open Space are Important for Providing a Place for Children to Play (29)	78%	71%	90%	64%	83%
Parks and Open Space are Important for Providing a Place for Time with Family (29)	82%	77%	90%	79%	78%
Parks and Open Space are Important for Providing a Place for Time with Friends (29)	84%	86%	86%	86%	86%

Sources:

(19) NSRE (2000-2003) sample size	1,016				
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size:	500	245	100	15	95
(29) BAOSC (2003-4)	283	125	92	14	36

Picnic at Contra Loma Park



Photo by Salvador Davila

DIFFERENT WAYS OF WALKING

Walking for pleasure is the top activity for people who live in the Bay Area. Almost everyone says they do it, and positive response is consistently high (from 81% to 93%) regardless of ethnicity.

However, the way people walk varies considerably by ethnicity. When surveys distinguish between “walking” and “hiking”, the hikers end up being disproportionately white. And if hiking involves carrying a pack on your back, the pattern is even more pronounced, with whites participating at a rate twice that of Latinos, and five times that of African Americans.

The distinction between walking and hiking does not appear to be about whether the trail is paved. As shown in one recent statewide poll (PPIC -20), Latinos report about the same use of unpaved trails as the average respondent. Participation rates by Asians Americans in hiking and backpacking vary a great deal by survey, but most suggest a participation rate similar or a little lower than for whites.

Another distinction between walking styles involved dogs. In some parks, dog walking has become a major activity. Nearly a third of the people surveyed at the Redwood Park trailhead on Skyline Drive were dog walkers. Here and elsewhere, dog walkers using regional park trails are predominantly white or Asian American.

Photo by John Woodbury



Walking the dog at Sibley Regional Park

The Different Ways of Walking

	Total	Ethnicity			
		White	Latino	African American	Asian American
Walking for Pleasure (19)		93%	81%	93%	87%
Backpacking (19)		22%	10%	4%	15%
Hiking (19)		61%	55%	21%	41%
Use County Parks for Walking/Running (22)	51%	54%	47%	73%	44%
Use County Parks for Hiking (22)	20%	26%	5%	13%	21%
Use Regional Trails (10)					
Never	12%	10%	5%	29%	10%
Seldom (<1/mth)	21%	15%	30%	37%	45%
Sometimes (1/mth)	33%	33%	40%	23%	40%
Often (2+/mth)	34%	42%	25%	11%	5%
How Often Go Hiking or Mountain Biking on Unpaved Trails (20)					
Regularly	19%		16%		
Sometimes	27%		28%		
Hardly ever	24%		26%		
Never	30%		30%		
Hiking is a Frequent Activity (22)		20%	6%	25%	21%
Hiking is Activity You Do at This Park (29)	16%	22%	9%	7%	22%
Use Redwood RegPark for Walking (31)	24%	22%	75%	50%	24%
Use Redwood Reg Park for Hiking (31)	22%	25%	0%	0%	6%
Use Redwood Reg Park for Dog Walking (31)	27%	27%	8%	0%	35%
Using Pinole Park for Walking (30)	41%	52%	36%	7%	44%
Use Pinole Park for Dog Walking (30)	9%	17%	0%	0%	6%

Sources and Sample Size

(19) NSRE (2000-2003) sample size	1016				
(29) BAOSC (2003-4) sample size	283	125	92	14	36
(20) PPIC (June 2002) sample size	2029		~550		
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size	500	245	100	15	95
(30) BAOSC (2004) sample size	112	54	25	14	18
(31) BAOSC (2004) sample size	236	193	12	2	17
(10) EBRPD (June/July 2004) sample size:	300	201	20	35	20

APPRECIATING NATURAL AREAS

There is a distinct difference between whites and other ethnic groups when it comes to visiting the wilderness, with whites saying they do it at roughly twice the rate as other ethnicities.

Latinos visit highly developed parks in or near urban areas at approximately the same rate as the general population, and indicate more preference for such parks (30% compared to 22% for the general population). By contrast, Latinos visit natural or undeveloped areas less frequently, and prefer such parks only 16% compared to 28% for the general population.

Nearly everyone appreciates natural beauty, but how and where they experience it does vary by ethnicity.



Photo by John Woodbury

Appreciating Nature

	Total	Ethnicity		
		White	Latino	African American Asian
Wilderness Visit (19)		50%	29%	24% 29%
Visit/Prefer Highly Developed Parks in/near Urban Areas (2)				
2+ times/week	14%		14%	
Once a week	14%		12%	
1-2 times/month	19%		22%	
Several times a year	30%		36%	
Once or twice a year	16%		11%	
Never	7%		5%	
Stated Preference for this type of area/facility	22%		30%	
Visit/Prefer Developed Nature Oriented Parks Outside Urban Areas (2)				
2+ times/week	4%		3%	
Once a week	6%		6%	
1-2 times/month	19%		17%	
Several times a year	38%		37%	
Once or twice a year	23%		24%	
Never	10%		14%	
Stated Preference for this type of area/facility	36%		40%	
Visit/Prefer Natural and Undeveloped Areas (2)				
2+ times/week	4%		1%	
Once a week	4%		3%	
1-2 times/month	14%		11%	
Several times a year	28%		19%	
Once or twice a year	33%		40%	
Never	19%		27%	
Stated Preference for this type of area/facility	28%		16%	
How Often Take a Trip to a National Park or Other Scenic Destination (20)				
Regularly	23%		22%	
Sometimes	42%		41%	
Hardly ever	25%		25%	
Never	10%		12%	
<u>Sources and Sample Size</u>				
(2) State Parks (2003) sample size	2512		644	
(19) NSRE (2000-2003) sample size	1016			
(20) PPIC (June 2002)	2029		~550	

This doesn't mean Latinos place less value on nature. When it comes to visiting nature-oriented parks outside urban areas, Latinos say they do it at virtually the same rate as others, and even report a slightly higher preference for this type of park.

When considered in the context of other questions about picnicking, sports and family, it appears that Latinos prefer parks that have it all -- good facilities in beautiful settings.

CAMPING

All ethnic groups report using developed campgrounds. The rates are highest for whites (40%), and lowest for African Americans (26%).

While the results of different surveys are mixed, it appears that camping rates for Latinos are similar to those for whites.

Camping

	Total	Ethnicity			
		White	Latino	African American	Asian American
State Park Users (2a)					
% of users that stay overnight	38%	37%	46%	36%	38%
Developed Camping (19)		40%	31%	26%	30%
Primitive Camping (19)		21%	12%	8%	10%
Camping is Activity You Do at this					
Park (29)	8%	13%	7%	7%	3%
Is Camping a Frequent Activity? (22)	9%	9%	9%	0%	12%
How Often Go On Overnight Trips That					
Involve Camping or Backpacking (21)					
Regularly	12%		13%		
Sometimes	26%		26%		
Hardly ever	28%		39%		
Never	34%		32%		
<u>Sources and Sample Size</u>					
(21) PPIC (June 2000)	2001		~480		
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sam	500	245	100	15	95
(29) BAOSC (2003-4)	283	125	92	14	36
(19) NSRE (2000-2003) sample size	1016				

There is considerably more difference in whether people go camping in primitive settings. Whites do this nearly twice as often as Latinos (21% compared to 12%), about twice as often as Asian Americans (21% compared to 10%) and about two and a half times more often than African Americans (21% compared to 8 percent).

Different ethnic groups enjoy camping, with most surveys showing the highest participation rates by Latinos and whites. However, roughly half as many people camp at primitive sites, and those who do are predominantly white.



Photo by Salvador Davila

Sports and Hobbies

	Total	Ethnicity		
		White	Latino American	African American Asian
Sports is Activity You Do At This Park (29)	29%	18%	43%	7% 36%
Use County Parks for Playgrounds (22)	9%	7%	17%	0% 9%
Is Baseball/Softball a Frequent Activity? (22)	10%	8%	14%	19% 8%
Use County Parks for Baseball/Softball (22)	6%	4%	11%	14% 6%
Is Basketball a Frequent Activity? (22)	8%	5%	9%	13% 16%
Use County Parks for Basketball (22)	4%	2%	2%	7% 8%
Is Tennis a Frequent Activity? (22)	13%	11%	8%	6% 20%
Use County Parks for Tennis (22)	4%	2%	1%	0% 8%
Bicycling (19)		50%	41%	43% 42%
Bicycling is Activity You Do At This Park (29)	11%	12%	10%	0% 8%
Bicycling is Activity At Redwood Reg Park (31)	14%	15%	0%	0% 35%
Bicycling is Activity At Pinole Reg Park (30)	10%	6%	28%	0% 6%
Mountain Biking (19)		30%	24%	21% 25%
Use County Parks for Biking (22)	14%	13%	13%	7% 17%
Is Bicycling a Frequent Activity (22)	19%	18%	16%	13% 22%
Swimming Outdoors (19)		55%	36%	20% 26%
Is Swimming a Frequent Activity? (22)	13%	13%	21%	6% 12%
Use County Parks for Swimming (22)	3%	4%	5%	0% 2%
Swimming is Activity You Do At This Park (29)	14%	10%	12%	36% 22%
Motorboating (19)		24%	19%	8% 13%
Is Boating/Waterskiing a Frequent Activity (22)	5%	6%	3%	6% 4%
Use County Parks for Boating/Waterskiing (22)	2%	2%	1%	0% 2%
All Fishing		23%	25%	20% 16%
Is Fishing a Frequent Activity? (22)	11%	13%	7%	19% 11%
Use County Parks for Fishing (22)	6%	6%	6%	0% 8%
Fishing is Activity You Do At This Park (29)	5%	3%	4%	14% 8%
Fishing is Activity at Pinole Reg Park (30)	12%	2%	24%	14% 22%
Bird Watching is Activity You Do At This Park (29)	5%	7%	1%	7% 3%
Passive Recreation is Activity You Do At This Park (2	42%	39%	41%	36% 47%
View or Photograph Natural Scenery		79%	57%	42% 69%
View or Photograph Wildflowers/Trees (19)		65%	34%	27% 39%
View or Photograph Birds (19)		39%	19%	23% 26%
All Horseback Riding (19)		13%	6%	13% 3%
Use County Parks for Horseback Riding (22)	1%	1%	0%	0% 0%
Is Archery/Shooting a Frequent Activity? (22)	1%	2%	0%	0% 0%
Use County Parks for Archery/Shooting (22)	1%	1%	0%	0% 0%
<u>Sources and Sample Size</u>				
(19) NSRE (2000-2003) sample size	1016			
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size:	500	245	100	15 95
(28) SMMC (2003) sample size	912			
(29) BAOSC (2003-4)	283	125	92	14 36
(31) BAOSC (2004) sample size	236	193	12	2 17

SPORTS AND HOBBIES

Outdoor sports and hobbies vary widely by ethnicity.

Organized sporting activities (baseball, basketball, tennis) tend to be enjoyed by whites at a lower rate than other groups. Given Latino emphasis on enjoying parks with their families, this group not surprisingly shows a much higher practice of using parks for their playgrounds. The evidence on outdoor swimming is mixed. Some surveys suggest whites are more likely to swim outdoors, but other surveys show just the reverse.

At the same time, all ethnic groups self-report at similar levels that “passive recreation” is something they go to parks to do (from a high of 47% for Asian Americans to a low of 36% for African Americans).

All ethnic groups use parks for organized sports, but participation rates are generally lower for whites than other groups



Photo by Salvador Davila



Photo by John Woodbury

Bird watching and wildlife viewing is engaged in more by whites than other groups

The evidence on bicycling is similarly mixed. While the most comprehensive regional survey suggests whites are a little more likely to go bicycling or mountain biking, data from specific parks is highly variable. This suggests usage rates are a function of access and opportunity, not interest. In Pinole Regional Park, for example, 28% of Latinos at the park were cyclists, compared to only 8% of whites.

Fishing as an activity also cuts across ethnic lines. Regional data shows similar rates for all but Asian Americans, but at the local level dramatically higher participation rates show up for different groups depending on the location. Once again, this suggests usage rates are a function of access and opportunity, not interest.

A variety of studies show whites are much more likely than other groups to engage in bird watching. When it comes to taking photo-

Special Activities

	Total	Ethnicity			
		White	Latino American	African American	Asian American
Visit Farm/Ag Setting (19)		33%	17%	23%	21%
Visit a Beach (19)		67%	53%	44%	54%
Visit San Francisco Bay for pleasure (18)					
	Frequently	42%	53%	37%	47%
	Occasionally	47%	41%	56%	35%
	Never	11%	6%	3%	18%
Visit Ocean Beaches (18)					
	Frequently	26%	34%	15%	32%
	Occasionally	61%	55%	72%	54%
	Never	12%	11%	13%	13%
Usually Visit Beach/Ocean for Outdoor Activities(22)	1%	1%	2%	0%	0%
Visit Local Creeks and Creek Trails (18)					
	Frequently	15%	14%	12%	14%
	Occasionally	47%	46%	53%	41%
	Never	35%	37%	35%	42%
Visit Marinas for pleasure (18)					
	Frequently	23%	24%	19%	32%
	Occasionally	50%	54%	78%	33%
	Never	26%	22%	4%	36%
Visit Local Wetlands for pleasure (18)					
	Frequently	11%	9%	3%	5%
	Occasionally	40%	48%	41%	37%
	Never	47%	43%	53%	58%
Visit Nature Centes/Zoos (19)		75%	65%	52%	63%
Visit Historic Sites (19)		69%	41%	47%	46%
Visit Prehistoric Sites (19)		25%	22%	22%	21%
Visit/Prefer Historical and Cultural Buildings and Sites (2)					
	2+ times/week	7%	3%		
	Once a week	2%	3%		
	1-2 times/month	9%	6%		
	Several times a year	37%	32%		
	Once or twice a year	37%	38%		
	Never	14%	19%		
Stated Preference for this type of area/facility	9%	9%			
Visit Nature Centers Along SF Bay (18)					
	Frequently	22%	31%	25%	19%
	Occasionally	59%	54%	60%	63%
	Never	17%	15%	8%	19%
If Don't Visit Nature Centers Along SF Bay, Why Not? (18a)					
	No time	30%	14%	0%	50%
	Not interested	23%	36%	57%	25%
	None in my Area	18%	33%	43%	12%
	Unaware of Them	10%	16%	0%	0%
Sources and Sample Size					
(2) State Parks (2003) sample size	2512		644		
(18) Audubon (Nov 2000) Sample size:	700	420	91	56	91
(18a) Audubon (Nov 2000) sample size	117	75	14	4	17
(19) NSRE (2000-2003) sample size	1016				
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size:	500	245	100	15	95

Photo by Bob Walker



Whites are most likely to engage in nature photography.

graphs or viewing the sights, whites participate the most (at 79%), and the differences between ethnic groups is even greater when it involves photographing birds, flowers or trees.

Horseback riding is popular with whites and with African Americans. Archery is almost exclusively a white sport.

SPECIAL ACTIVITIES

Visiting ocean beaches and local creeks and trails is popular with all ethnic groups, though the rate for African Americans generally appears to be a little lower than for other groups. When comparing visitation rates for San Francisco Bay generally, and wetlands specifically, however, there is more difference. Whites are less likely than other groups to say they visit San Francisco Bay for pleasure, but more likely to say they frequently visit a local wetland.

All ethnic groups report strong interest in visiting nature centers and zoos, though the rate for whites (75%) appears to be the highest and that for African Americans (52%) the lowest. A similar pattern can be seen with visitation rates for historic and prehistoric facilities, though in this case the lowest visitation rates appear to be by Latinos.

Notably, visits to nature centers along *San Francisco Bay* are the same or higher for Latinos and African Americans, and somewhat lower for whites and Asian Americans.

When those who didn't visit nature centers along the bay were asked why they didn't, lack of time was the reason most often given by whites (33%) and Asian Americans, but not by Latinos or African Americans. While the sample size for this survey is too small to draw definite conclusions, it appears that lack of available facilities is an important factor in limiting visits by hispanics and blacks.

Visits to farms and other agricultural settings is most popular with whites (33%), compared to only 15% for Latino respondents, and 23% and 21% respectively for African American and Asian American respondents.

Nature centers are popular with kids and adults of all ethnic backgrounds.



Photo by Suzanne Easton

TRAVEL DISTANCE

Most park users travel less than 30 minutes to get to the park of their choice. However, African American and Latino park users are somewhat more likely to use parks within 10 minutes travel distance (56-60% in one study, compared to 43% for white and Asian American park users). A small percentage of white park users (about 10%) appear willing to travel more than one hour. Other groups are even less willing to travel this long.

Almost no one uses public transit to get to parks. A great many regional parks and recreation areas are served by public transit, so in

It takes a major attraction like Pacifica Beach to entice most people to travel more than 30 minutes to a park.



Photo by Salvador Davila

Travel Distance By Ethnicity

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ethnicity</u>			
		<u>White</u>	<u>Latino</u>	<u>African American</u>	<u>Asian American</u>
How Far Drive to Most Frequent Outdoor Activity (5)					
<10 minutes	47%	43%	56%	60%	43%
11-30 minutes	29%	25%	31%	33%	33%
31-60 minutes	11%	12%	5%	0%	17%
61-90 minutes	2%	4%	1%	0%	1%
91-120 minutes	2%	3%	2%	0%	1%
more than 121 minutes	4%	4%	0%	0%	1%
Don't Drive there	8%	12%	2%	7%	3%
Source:					
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size	500	245	100	15	95

theory there is considerable access to the outdoors even for those who do not drive. Lack of public transit usage may partly be due to a lack of information about transit options. Mostly, however, it appears that when it involves recreation and leisure, not many people are willing to devote the extra time or extra hassle in planning, organizing and carrying supplies that is required to use public transit.

Of those who don't drive, walking and bicycling are the most common forms of access.

These facts demonstrate the importance of having a comprehensive network of neighborhood and local parks and trails, particularly to serve recreational and family-oriented activities desired on a daily or weekly basis.

At the same time, given the pattern of development in the Bay Area, and the way it is intermixed with regional parks and areas of natural beauty, nearly every community in the region is within 30 minutes

drive of a significant number and variety of large relatively natural parks. Thus, to the extent that park usage rates at less improved regional parks may be lower for African Americans, Asian Americans and Latinos, the reasons are most likely less related to lack of access than to activity preferences and/or knowledge about opportunities.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Apart from those who use particular parks because they see them in the course of their routine daily activities, most park users and the general public get their information through word of mouth from friends, family and others with whom they have personal interactions. As a result, outreach techniques that take advantage of existing affiliations (church, school) and social grouping should be a top priority for park agencies and land conservation organizations.

The need and potential to take more effective advantage of these types of networks is suggested by one survey, which found that whites were significantly more likely to get information about environmental issues from organizations to which they belong than were other ethnic groups. The disparity was greatest for Latinos.

Latinos also expressed the least propensity to get environmental news from the written media. Both this and the previous observation are likely influenced at least in part by language barriers, and the failure of park agencies and land conservation organizations to

Sources of Information About Environmental Issues

		Total	Ethnicity			
			White	Latino	African American	Asian American
Local TV News Programs	Frequently	65%	61%	74%	70%	74%
	Occasionally	20%	21%	15%	19%	15%
	Rarely/Never	15%	17%	10%	10%	7%
Radio	Frequently	33%	33%	30%	39%	28%
	Occasionally	35%	33%	36%	47%	41%
	Rarely/Never	30%	33%	32%	14%	28%
Internet	Frequently	21%	18%	19%	22%	37%
	Occasionally	26%	24%	30%	36%	28%
	Rarely/Never	50%	55%	46%	39%	32%
Newspapers	Frequently	56%	59%	39%	66%	63%
	Occasionally	23%	23%	30%	25%	20%
	Rarely/Never	18%	18%	27%	9%	14%
Mail from Organizations of Which You Are a Member						
	Frequently	16%	18%	10%	18%	12%
	Occasionally	27%	30%	14%	42%	20%
	Rarely/Never	54%	50%	71%	38%	63%
How Did You Find Out About This Park (29)						
	Saw the Park	58%	69%	47%	57%	56%
	Friend/Family member	37%	27%	47%	43%	39%
	TV/radio	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Source:						
(18) Audubon (Nov 2000) sample size:		700	420	91	56	91
(29) BAOSC (2003-4)		283	125	92	14	36

make very much of their informational material available in Spanish.

Not surprisingly, the most frequently cited source of information was television. This was true for all ethnic groups. However, in addition to doing more to expand information distribution to and

coverage by TV and radio, the internet appears to be developing into a fruitful avenue for outreach and educational efforts. One survey in 2000 found the internet to be a frequent source of information about environmental issues for 21 percent of respondents, and an occasional source for another 26 percent. Contrary to stereotype, in this survey whites said they were the least likely to rely on the internet.

Since this survey, internet usage has continued to increase dramatically. Thus, its potential value in making information available to communities of color should be given further scrutiny. However, it is important to remember that the internet in and of itself is a passive medium. To be effective, information placed on the internet needs to be linked to active outreach mechanisms.

V. Attitudes Toward Parks and Open Space

PARK USERS COMPARED TO NON-PARK USERS

Shifting from park and recreation participation rates to the question of attitudes toward parks and open space, a threshold question is whether park usage has an effect on how people feel about parks and open space. Across the board, survey data supports the logical hypothesis. Compared to non-park users, park users place a higher value on parks, picnic areas and wilderness, place a higher priority on purchasing additional open space, and are more willing to raise taxes for these purposes. Interestingly, non-park users are more interested in improving existing parks contrasted to buying open space (58% to 17%) than are park users (50% to 36%). This might reflect lower interest in conserving open space, or more interest by non-users in providing more facilities so they can use parks more.

INTEREST IN PRESERVING NATURE

Although there are some differences in how different ethnic groups respond to questions about importance of open space and habitat, the similarity of results is most striking, as is the strong support all groups express for protecting the natural world.

By overwhelming margins (in the 70-90% range), all ethnic groups feel that the loss of open space and the rate at which land is being developed are serious problems. Depending on the survey and how the questions are asked, there are some differences in response rates, but the range is at most 12%, and high and low rates are not

consistently distributed.

All ethnic groups give similar and positive responses on the question of the importance of buying land to protect open space (80-90% believing it to be extremely or very important). A majority for all ethnic groups says it is extremely or very important to create new large regional parks, and to preserve natural resources.

The natural features that get the highest ratings for being extremely important to the quality of life in the Bay Area are San Francisco Bay and the ocean and coastline.

There is broad support among all ethnic groups to preserve nature, particularly when it involves the ocean and coastline.



Photo by John Woodbury

Attitudes of Park Users Compared to Non-Park Users

	Park Users	Non-Park Users
Are regional parks having parks, picnic acres, wilderness areas & trails a valuable public resource & service? (8)		
Strongly agree	93%	83%
Somewhat agree	3%	10%
Somewhat disagree	1%	3%
Strongly disagree	2%	6%
Is purchasing additional open space a priority? (17)		
High priority	36%	19%
Medium Priority	29%	22%
Low Priority	30%	53%
Is developing and improving public recreational uses for existing open space lands a priority? (17)		
High priority	32%	38%
Medium Priority	43%	24%
Low Priority	20%	33%
Should buying open space or developing existing parks have priority?		
Buy open space	36%	17%
Developing existing open space	50%	58%
Support \$12 property tax assessment for public recreation improvements?		
Strong support	41%	18%
Some support	23%	32%
Some oppose	11%	12%
Strong oppose	22%	32%
How vote on parcel tax for O&M at \$10/yr for single family homes and \$7/yr for apartments (8)		
Strongly agree	56%	58%
Somewhat agree	30%	20%
Somewhat disagree	4%	6%
Strongly disagree	5%	14%
EBRPD Zone 1 O&M parcel tax (11)		
Strongly agree	36%	36%
Somewhat agree	26%	15%
Somewhat disagree	7%	6%
Strongly disagree	12%	21%

Sources:

(8) EBRPD (2001 district-wide surveys)

(11) EBRPD Zone One (June 2004) sample size 400

(17) MIROSD (1994) sample size 500

There is also considerable support for other natural features, including creeks, wetlands, tidal marshes, and oak and redwood forests. Differences in responses depending on how questions were asked, however, suggest there may be a useful role for public education. When asked, with no context or rationale, about the importance of wetlands and tidal marshes, non-white responses tend to be lower than those of whites. However, when asked about the importance of wetlands for wildlife habitat and clean water, responses are consistently high for all ethnicities.

Finally, protection of habitat, forests, water bodies and open space all show higher levels of support across all ethnicities than does protection of farm and ranch land.

It is important to note, however, that just because people appreciate nature doesn't mean they want to appreciate it in solitude. Across all ethnicities, approximately twice as many people said nature was one of the things they valued most about parks and open space, compared to those who said solitude.

INTEREST IN RECREATION

Interest in providing outdoor recreational facilities is also high across all ethnic groups.

Those who felt it was extremely important to provide various types of outdoor recreational facilities overwhelmingly outnumbered those who felt they were not at all important, with the single exception of golf courses. For public golf courses, in one survey 20% overall said they were extremely important, while 26% said they were not at all important. A particularly high percentage of African Americans reported they were not at all important (though the sample size for this one survey is quite small).



Photo by Salvador Davila

There is broad support among all ethnic groups for active recreational facilities.

Providing overnight camping facilities was considered extremely or very important by about three-fourths of all respondents, with rates from Asian Americans and African Americans slightly lower than rates for whites and Latinos.

All groups were equally strong in their belief that providing places to exercise was extremely or very important.

Consistent with other results discussed in this report, on the question of developing family oriented recreational opportunities, 60% of Latinos said this was extremely important, with 88% saying it was either extremely or very important. This "extremely important" response rate was 50% higher than any other ethnic group.

While still high, support levels did drop when a question was posed that placed the importance of parks and recreation in a broader context. Asked about *using limited funds*, those who said it was extremely or very important to provide for swimming, hiking,

Interest in Preserving Nature

Serious Problems

Extremely Important to Bay Area Quality of Life	Loss of open space (1)	81%	82%	84%	72%	74%
	Loss of open space (18)	87%	87%	88%	93%	83%
	Growth and development* (1)	9%	11%	10%	0%	4%
	Rate at which land is being developed (18)	86%	87%	83%	93%	82%
	Loss of farm land (18)	75%	77%	71%	77%	69%
	San Francisco Bay (1)	67%	68%	67%	64%	44%
	San Francisco Bay (18)	70%	73%	60%	80%	66%
	Oak and redwood forests (1)	50%	51%	49%	38%	35%
	Habitat for plants, fish and wildlife (1)	48%	47%	54%	47%	43%
	Ocean and coastline (18)	68%	71%	64%	75%	58%
	Local creeks, rivers and streams (1)	44%	44%	51%	40%	33%
	Local creeks (18)	37%	39%	37%	44%	26%
	Local wetlands (18)	36%	40%	33%	29%	24%
	Tidal marshes (18)	33%	38%	26%	29%	21%
	Open space (1)	44%	43%	46%	36%	39%
	Open space (18)	49%	49%	48%	65%	36%
	Farm and ranch land (1)	29%	30%	26%	28%	11%
	Purchase Wetlands to Protect Them? (18)	Strongly support	41%	42%	44%	28%
Somewhat support		41%	41%	39%	58%	38%
Somewhat oppose		8%	8%	7%	4%	12%
Strongly oppose		4%	4%	2%	0%	2%

restoring Wetlands for Wildlife Habitat and Clean Water (18)

Strongly support	54%	54%	47%	57%	61%
Somewhat support	35%	35%	43%	33%	30%
Somewhat oppose	4%	4%	0%	4%	5%
Strongly oppose	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%

Buy Land to Protect Open Space /Natural Resources (22)

Extremely Important	60%	61%	57%	63%	58%
Very important	26%	27%	27%	31%	27%
Not very important	6%	7%	3%	0%	6%
Not at all important	5%	4%	4%	6%	6%

Creating New Large Regional Parks (22)

Extremely Important	31%	26%	41%	38%	31%
Very important	41%	46%	32%	25%	43%
Not very important	15%	16%	6%	25%	19%
Not at all important	9%	9%	13%	13%	5%

Preserving Natural Resources in County Parks (22)

Extremely Important	59%	62%	55%	63%	49%
Very important	32%	30%	32%	25%	41%
Not very important	3%	3%	4%	6%	3%
Not at all important	4%	4%	2%	6%	4%

Interest in Preserving Nature (continued)

	Total	Ethnicity			
		White	Latino American	African American	Asian American
Create Parks w/ Extensive Open Space/Trails (22)					
Extremely Important	33%	37%	30%	38%	27%
Very important	38%	34%	40%	50%	43%
Not very important	16%	18%	12%	6%	19%
Not at all important	10%	10%	11%	6%	8%
What value most about parks and open space (29)					
nature	82%	91%	67%	64%	94%
solitude	38%	38%	37%	29%	39%

Note:

* this was a volunteered response to an open-ended question

Sources:

- (1) BAOSC (Nov 2000)—Sample Size: 900
- (1a) BAOSC (Nov 2000)—Sample Size: 640
- (18) National Audubon (Nov 2000)—Sample Size: 700
- (20) PPIC (2002) 2029
- (22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size 500
- (29) BAOSC park user survey 2003-4 100

	651	70	47	54
	458	61	33	40
	420	91	56	91
	~550			
	245	100	15	95



Photo by John Woodbury

Parks where you can take kids to play score high with all ethnic groups, and especially hispanics.

biking, wildlife viewing and recreational facilities dropped to about 50%. This compares to about 75% for questions which did not introduce the notion of priority for limited funding.

Interestingly, the drop in the proportion of *strong support* was greater for whites than Latinos and African Americans. At the same time, at the other end of the spectrum, the proportion of people who decided parks and recreation were *not very important* in the context of competition for limited funds was greatest for African Americans and Latinos. However, it's not clear why this would be so. It might be a function of other factors such as income interacting together with ethnicity, or it might just be an anomaly of this survey.

Interest in Recreation

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ethnicity</u>		
		<u>White</u>	<u>Latino American</u>	<u>African American</u>
Extremely Important to Bay Area Quality of Life (1)				
Parks and recreation areas	40%	39%	41%	49%
Should Picnic Areas be a Priority? (10)				
High	46%	42%	40%	66%
Medium	48%	52%	55%	34%
Low	5%	6%	5%	0%
Using Limited Funds for Swimming, Hiking, Biking, Wildlife Viewing and Recreational Activities (18)				
Extremely Important	25%	24%	30%	33%
Very important	31%	31%	37%	8%
Somewhat important	30%	34%	20%	23%
Not too important	13%	11%	13%	35%
Creating New Neighborhood Parks (22)				
Extremely Important	42%	41%	50%	44%
Very important	36%	36%	31%	44%
Not very important	13%	13%	9%	6%
Not at all important	6%	7%	5%	6%
Building Outdoor Active Facilities (22)				
Extremely Important	47%	42%	56%	63%
Very important	34%	38%	29%	25%
Not very important	10%	12%	3%	0%
Not at all important	6%	6%	5%	13%
Developing Public Golf Courses (22)				
Extremely Important	20%	21%	19%	25%
Very important	23%	23%	26%	19%
Not very important	25%	27%	20%	13%
Not at all important	26%	25%	27%	44%
Providing More Overnight Camping Locations (22)				
Extremely Important	35%	32%	42%	31%
Very important	37%	42%	33%	31%
Not very important	13%	13%	7%	6%
Not at all important	12%	11%	12%	31%
Developing Family Oriented Recreation (22)				
Extremely Important	47%	44%	60%	44%
Very important	38%	40%	28%	38%
Not very important	8%	10%	3%	6%
Not at all important	4%	4%	2%	13%
Providing Place to Exercise (22)				
Extremely Important	44%	41%	46%	31%
Very important	36%	40%	30%	50%
Not very important	11%	11%	11%	0%
Not at all important	7%	7%	7%	19%
Offering Educational Programs About Nature (22)				
Extremely Important	44%	41%	49%	31%
Very important	38%	39%	38%	63%
Not very important	9%	12%	4%	6%

Interest in Recreation (continued)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ethnicity</u>			
		<u>White</u>	<u>Latino American</u>	<u>African American</u>	<u>Asian American</u>
Creating More Access to Lakes/Streams (22)					
Extremely Important	35%	34%	40%	31%	27%
Very important	34%	40%	34%	31%	38%
Not very important	17%	19%	11%	0%	24%
Not at all important	11%	10%	10%	38%	9%
Creating More Swimming Locations (22)					
Extremely Important	39%	37%	47%	31%	32%
Very important	36%	37%	28%	31%	49%
Not very important	13%	16%	9%	13%	12%
Not at all important	9%	9%	10%	25%	6%
Upgrading/Improving Unpaved Trails (22)					
Extremely Important	35%	32%	36%	50%	32%
Very important	40%	41%	39%	38%	46%
Not very important	12%	14%	7%	6%	14%
Not at all important	9%	9%	10%	6%	7%
Developing Activities/Programs for Youth (22)					
Extremely Important	57%	54%	63%	69%	58%
Very important	31%	34%	26%	19%	31%
Not very important	4%	5%	1%	0%	6%
Not at all important	5%	6%	2%	13%	4%
Sources					
(1) BAOSC (Nov 2000)—Sample Size:	900	651	70	47	54
(18) National Audubon (Nov 2000)—Sample Size:	700	420	91	56	91
(10) EBRPD Zone One (June/July 2004) Sample size:	300	201	20	35	20
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size	500	245	100	15	95

Wild or Improved?

What Is Your Highest Priority for SCC Parks (22)

Developing outdoor recreational facilities and programs	25%	24%	22%	25%	36%
Developing extensive educational programs about nature	15%	12%	21%	25%	11%
Upgrading and/or developing new trails	10%	14%	7%	0%	6%
Purchasing land to create new parks/protect resources	25%	25%	23%	19%	32%
All of the above	17%	19%	22%	31%	8%
None of the above	3%	3%	2%	0%	2%

Strongly Felt Agreement: (2)

More community parks needed near me	31%		45%		
More parks are needed in urban areas	50%		53%		
More recreation areas are needed by lakes	46%		57%		
Maintaining a natural environment is important	76%		80%		
Outdoor parks are too crowded	35%		46%		
I do not feel safe using outdoor parks	12%		19%		
Additional developed campgrounds are needed	40%		55%		

Priority for Developed Parks or Undeveloped Open Space (20)

Open space in my region should be protected for the preservation of species and natural habitats

55%

Open space in my region should be developed for parks, sports and recreational use

38%

What value most about parks and open space (29)

nature	82%	91%	67%	64%	94%
solitude	38%	38%	37%	29%	39%
recreation	87%	86%	92%	79%	83%
land protection	54%	65%	39%	36%	56%
water quality protection	39%	42%	26%	36%	58%
wildlife protection	53%	65%	35%	50%	64%
scenery	87%	92%	83%	86%	89%
place for children to play	78%	71%	90%	64%	83%

Sources:

(2) State Parks (2003) sample size	2512		644		
(20) PPIC (2002)	2029		~550		
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size	500	245	100	15	95
29) BAOSC (2003-4)	283	125	92	14	36

WILD OR IMPROVED?

Although support for preserving nature and for providing outdoor recreational opportunities is high among all ethnic groups, Bay Area data is similar to national data in suggesting there are some differences between ethnic groups in terms of priorities.

Latinos and African Americans express the strongest priority for educational programs about nature (at twice the rate as whites and Asians). Latinos place a high value on parks as a place for children to play (90% say this); African Americans and whites are considerably less likely to give this reason.

Latinos also express a higher interest in more community parks

Preservation of species and natural habitat generates the highest levels of support, especially among Latinos and whites.



Photo by John Woodbury

near to where they live than does the general population (45% compared to 31%). This may be the result of different values, or an indication that they live in neighborhoods that are park-poor.

When describing what they value most about parks and open space, whites and Asian Americans are much more likely to mention nature than are Latinos and African Americans. Whites are much more likely to value parks for their role in protecting land (65%), compared to Latinos (39%) and African Americans (35%), though only a little higher than Asian Americans (56%).

However, caution is important in interpreting these results. Latinos are not more in favor of more urban parks *per se* than the general population--both groups say they are important (53% compared to 50%). Both groups emphasize the importance of maintaining a natural environment (76% to 80%). Latinos *are* more concerned about overcrowding in parks (46% to 35%).

Furthermore, when open space for preservation of species and natural habitats is pitted against open space for parks, sports and recreational use, the general populace favors the former 55% to 38%. Latinos split 53% to 42% on this question. Statistically, there is no difference between Latinos and the general populace when it comes to a desire to protect nature.

INTEREST IN WATER QUALITY AND POLLUTION

Just as nearly everyone believes it is important to preserve nature, so too nearly everyone thinks air and water quality are extremely or very important to

Interest in Water Quality and Pollution

	Total	Ethnicity			
		White	Latino	African American	Asian American
Serious Problems					
Pollution of lakes, rivers, streams and Bay (1)	83%	83%	77%	79%	80%
Pollution in SF Bay (18)	90%	90%	83%	100%	95%
Pollution in rivers and streams (18)	88%	88%	85%	90%	94%
Quality of drinking water (18)	74%	70%	81%	89%	80%
Air pollution and smog (18)	89%	89%	85%	100%	91%
Extremely Important to Bay Area Quality of Life					
Air quality (1)	62%	60%	67%	62%	61%
Air quality (18)	66%	64%	61%	82%	72%
Water quality (1)	54%	54%	53%	60%	54%
Water quality (18)	66%	62%	71%	71%	74%
to Improve Water Quality in Rivers and Streams (18)					
Extremely Important	38%	34%	43%	43%	46%
Very important	45%	46%	46%	50%	42%
Somewhat important	12%	14%	6%	7%	12%
Not too important	4%	5%	5%	0%	0%
Using Limited Funds to Reduce Bay Pollution (18)					
Extremely Important	56%	51%	61%	48%	75%
Very important	32%	36%	28%	24%	17%
Somewhat important	10%	9%	11%	28%	8%
Not too important	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Sources:					
(1) BAOSC (Nov 2000)—Sample Size:	900	651	70	47	54
(10) EBRPD Zone One (June/July 2004) Sample siz	300	201	20	35	20
(18) National Audubon (Nov 2000)—Sample Size:	700	420	91	56	91
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size	500	245			

ATTITUDES TOWARD MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS

Two-thirds of all people in the Bay Area believe the condition of parks and recreation areas is a serious problem. A similar proportion thinks it is extremely or very important to provide for the maintenance and improvement for parks. One survey found that half of all respondents felt it was extremely important to add patrols and security to parks and trails, with a total of 81% saying this was extremely or very important. These attitudes are fairly even across all ethnic groups, though concern about maintenance and security appears to be somewhat higher for African Americans.



Photo by Salvador Davila

everyone thinks it is extremely or very important to improve water quality in our rivers and streams, and nearly everyone is willing to make this a spending priority.

Good maintenance is a priority for two-thirds of Bay Area residents.

Interest in Good Maintenance and Operations

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ethnicity</u>		
		<u>White</u>	<u>Latino American</u>	<u>African American</u> <u>Asian</u>
Serious Problem				
Condition of park and recreation areas (18)	68%	65%	71%	84%
Should Facility Maintenance incl. Ranger/Police Facilities be a Priority? (10)				
High	64%	62%	65%	80%
Medium	31%	33%	25%	17%
Low	4%	3%	10%	3%
Provide Maintenance/Improvements in Parks (22)				
Extremely Important	66%	66%	61%	69%
Very important	28%	31%	26%	31%
Not very important	2%	1%	4%	0%
Not at all important	2%	1%	3%	0%
Adding Patrols and Security to Parks/Trails (22)				
Extremely Important	51%	48%	55%	63%
Very important	30%	31%	30%	31%
Not very important	11%	13%	5%	6%
Not at all important	4%	6%	4%	0%
Overall Quality of Parks (22)				
Excellent	23%	25%	17%	40%
Good	58%	58%	61%	40%
Only Fair	15%	13%	17%	13%
Poor	2%	1%	6%	0%
Quality of Services Offered (22)				
Excellent	10%	12%	6%	7%
Good	51%	53%	58%	47%
Only Fair	24%	22%	24%	27%
Poor	5%	3%	8%	7%
Maintenance and Upkeep (22)				
Excellent	22%	23%	22%	33%
Good	53%	54%	54%	27%
Only Fair	19%	15%	20%	33%
Poor	3%	4%	4%	0%
Helpfulness of Park Rangers and Staff (22)				
Excellent	20%	20%	21%	27%
Good	45%	49%	47%	33%
Only Fair	14%	11%	11%	20%
Poor	5%	3%	8%	7%
(18) National Audubon (Nov 2000)—Sample Size:	700	420	91	56
(10) EBRPD Zone One (June/July 2004) Sample siz	300	201	20	35
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size	500	245	100	15

WILLINGNESS TO TAX AND SPEND ON PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

People of all ethnic backgrounds are by large margins willing to support new taxes and allocation of existing funds for a wide range of conservation purposes. When strong and probable supporters are grouped together, there is little difference between ethnic groups on their willingness to approve new taxes and fees. Depending on the type of tax, the survey, and how the question is asked, support across all categories is in the 70 to 90 percent range.

There are some differences. Most surveys suggest a somewhat lower, though still positive, level of support by African American voters, but the evidence is mixed. Some surveys suggest Latinos may support taxes for conservation and recreation purposes at higher levels than other ethnic groups. It also appears that Latino voters are more willing than other ethnic groups to increase sales taxes for conservation and recreation purposes.

This high level of support by Latinos is particularly striking because Latinos in the Bay Area are more likely to be lower income and without a college education. Since both of these factors are themselves strongly and positively correlated to willingness of tax and spend on parks and open space, the high support shown by Latinos suggests underlying cultural values about parks and open space must be particularly strong.

Willingness to Tax and Spend		Total	Ethnicity			
			White	Latino American	African American	Asian American
"Modest Parcel Tax" (1)	Yes	76%	82%	75%	66%	65%
	No	14%	10%	15%	23%	25%
	Depends on Amount	6%	6%	5%	11%	0%
	Unsure	3%	3%	5%		10%
\$15/year Parcel Tax (1)	Definitely Support	64%	73%	55%	51%	45%
	Probably Support	23%	16%	35%	31%	30%
	Unsure	2%	2%	5%	0%	0%
	Probably Oppose	5%	2%	5%	6%	20%
Ballot measure to Preserve Clean Water, Open Space, farm and ranch lands, parks, trails, fish and wildlife habitat, and nature education (2)	Definitely Oppose	7%	7%	0%	11%	5%
	Total support	71%	69%	81%	91%	76%
	Total oppose	12%	14%	6%	4%	9%
	1/10% Sales Tax for Clean Water, Open Space, farm and ranch lands, parks, trails, fish and wildlife habitat, and nature education (2)					
Regional Sales Tax to Protect Land (3)	Total support	71%	70%	87%	70%	74%
	Total oppose	16%	18%	6%	15%	11%
	Strongly support	12%	10%	19%	6%	18%
	Somewhat support	30%	30%	34%	25%	33%
	Somewhat oppose	24%	26%	15%	18%	26%
	Oppose	30%	29%	26%	44%	20%

Willingness to Tax and Spend (continued)

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ethnicity</u>		
		<u>White</u>	<u>Latino American</u>	<u>African American</u>
Willingness to Impose Fees on New Private Development (2)	63%	63%	70%	53%
Additional Fees on Private Developers for Habitat and Open Space (3)				
Strongly support	39%	40%	40%	55%
Somewhat support	37%	35%	39%	35%
Somewhat oppose	10%	12%	11%	0%
Oppose	9%	8%	5%	7%
Support for \$4 Vehicle Reg Fee for Clean Water (2)	68%	67%	80%	66%
Tax Credits/Incentives to Conserve Wetlands (3)				
Strongly support	48%	50%	42%	33%
Somewhat support	37%	38%	32%	47%
Somewhat oppose	6%	5%	10%	11%
Strongly oppose	4%	3%	4%	9%
New Funds to Protect and Restore Bay Wetlands, Marshes, Grasslands and Forests (3)				
Strongly support	46%	50%	41%	23%
Somewhat support	37%	36%	36%	39%
Somewhat oppose	7%	6%	10%	16%
Strongly oppose	5%	4%	5%	15%
Increase Property Tax to Protect Land (3)				
Strongly support	8%	8%	10%	3%
Somewhat support	23%	26%	21%	14%
Somewhat oppose	24%	23%	26%	19%
Strongly oppose	40%	37%	43%	53%
Increase Flat-Rate Assessment on Property to Protect Land (4)				
Strongly support	11%	10%	18%	10%
Somewhat support	32%	35%	36%	25%
Somewhat oppose	21%	20%	19%	21%
Strongly oppose	28%	28%	25%	35%
Increasing Taxes for Parks and Recreation (4)				
Strongly support	19%		25%	
Somewhat support	37%		41%	
Somewhat oppose	19%		15%	
Strongly oppose	25%		20%	
Increasing Use Fees for Parks and Recreation (4)				
Strongly support	20%		26%	
Somewhat support	34%		34%	
Somewhat oppose	20%		18%	
Strongly oppose	26%		22%	
Sources:				
(1) EBRPD Zone One (June/July 2004) sample size:	300	201	20	35
(2) BAOSC (Nov 2000) sample size:	900	651	47	47
(3) Audubon (2000) sample Size:	700	420	91	56
(4) State Parks (2003) sample size	2512		644	

Sources:

- (1) EBRPD Zone One (June/July 2004) sample size:
- (2) BAOSC (Nov 2000) sample size:
- (3) Audubon (2000) sample Size:
- (4) State Parks (2003) sample size

Willingness to Tax and Spend on Parks and Open Space

		Total	Ethnicity			
			White	Latino	African American	Asian
What You Like About a Proposed New Tax						
	Acquiring land within cities for urban parks (1c)	78%	78%	83%	89%	65%
	Protecting farm and ranch land (1c)	78%	76%	86%	85%	80%
	Preserving & restoring plant, fish and wildlife habitat (1c)	90%	88%	97%	96%	90%
	Protecting SF Bay from pollution (1c)	94%	92%	100%	93%	95%
	Protecting wetlands, creeks and marshes where unique plants and animals live (1c)	90%	89%	100%	85%	95%
	Outdoor education and curriculum development (1c)	84%	83%	94%	85%	90%
	Purchasing land for new regional parks (1c)	80%	80%	86%	93%	70%
	Research to restore and improve water quality (1c)	88%	86%	100%	93%	95%
	Acquiring open space to limit development (1c)	78%	78%	81%	70%	75%
	Purchasing green areas around cities to protect open space (1c)	85%	85%	88%	70%	85%
	Creating network of regional trails (1c)	83%	83%	91%	80%	76%
	Protecting and improving drinking water quality (1c)	92%	92%	100%	90%	91%
	Protecting ocean beaches and coastal areas (1c)	92%	92%	97%	90%	100%
	Making repairs to existing parks (1c)	92%	91%	94%	100%	94%
	Restoring wetlands, creek and tidal marshes where plant and animals live (1c)	86%	86%	91%	75%	91%
	Purchasing conservation easements to limit development (1c)	80%	82%	71%	65%	85%
Support for Additional Public Funding By Hispanics if Purpose Is: (2)						
	Walking for Fitness and Fun	20%		27%		
	Trail Hiking	25%		16%		
	Soccer, Football or Rugby	6%		12%		
	Softball and Baseball	6%		10%		
	Basketball	5%		10%		
Using Limited Funds to Protect Migrating Birds (18)						
	Extremely Important	30%	30%	33%	22%	30%
	Very important	41%	43%	40%	58%	31%
	Somewhat important	21%	19%	22%	19%	33%
	Not too important	6%	6%	5%	0%	6%
Using Limited Funds to Protect Grasslands (18)						
	Extremely Important	30%	29%	24%	41%	29%
	Very important	37%	38%	33%	43%	37%
	Somewhat important	23%	23%	37%	16%	26%

Willingness to Tax and Spend on Parks and Open Space (continued)

		Total	Ethnicity			
			White	Latino	African American	Asian American
Using Limited Funds to Protect Woodlands (18)						
	Extremely Important	32%	31%	40%	25%	34%
	Very important	40%	44%	30%	16%	37%
	Somewhat important	22%	19%	25%	41%	25%
	Not too important	5%	4%	5%	18%	5%
Using Limited Funds to Protect Habitat for Endangered Fish and Wildlife (18)						
	Extremely Important	43%	8%	64%	43%	49%
	Very important	37%	41%	16%	35%	43%
	Somewhat important	17%	16%	20%	22%	8%
	Not too important	3%	5%	0%	0%	0%
Reasons Why Supporters of New Tax Funds Vote YES						
	Preserve/protect nature (1a)	46%	45%	52%	52%	45%
	Water quality important (1a)	15%	13%	20%	24%	23%
Sources						
(1) BAOSC (Nov 2000)—Sample Size:		900	651	70	47	54
(1a) BAOSC (Nov 2000)—Sample Size		640	458	61	33	40
(1c) BAOSC (Nov 2000)—Sample Size:		450	326	36	27	20
(2) State Parks (2003) sample size		2512		644		
(10) EBRPD Zone One (June/July 2004) Sample size:		300	201	20	35	20
(18) National Audubon (Nov 2000)—Sample Size:		700	420	91	56	91
(22) Santa Clara County (2001) sample size		500	245	100	15	95

Highly popular reasons, among all ethnic groups, for supporting new taxes include habitat preservation, wildlife protection, improving water quality in rivers, the bay, the ocean and in drinking water.

Migrating birds, grasslands, woodlands, and endangered fish and wildlife--all are regarded as extremely or very important priorities for using limited funds. With one exception, this attitude spreads fairly evenly across the four broad ethnic groups considered in this report. The one exception has to do with woodlands, where African American support for using limited funds to protect woodlands is notably lower than for other groups. This

There may also be some differences between ethnic groups when strong and probable supporters are considered separately, although the evidence is mixed. Several surveys show white voters more likely than voters from other ethnic groups to be strong or definite supporters of new taxes, as opposed to just probable supporters. The notable exception to this observation is on questions related to increasing sales taxes.

finding is consistent with findings from some of the national studies.

There is also strong and widespread support for acquiring more land within cities for new urban parks. This support may be a little higher than average among African Americans, and a little lower than average among Asian Americans, although survey sample sizes for these groups are quite small and thus unreliable.

Tax Threshold by Ethnicity

	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ethnicity</u>		
		<u>White</u>	<u>Latino</u>	<u>African American</u> <u>Asian American</u>
Support Programs to Protect and Restore Lands Surrounding SF Bay if Cost is \$40/year (18)				
Strongly support	39%	41%	35%	30%
Somewhat support	24%	23%	24%	33%
Somewhat oppose	11%	11%	16%	9%
Strongly oppose	17%	17%	14%	18%
Support Programs to Protect and Restore Lands Surrounding SF Bay if Cost is \$15/year (18)				
Strongly support	53%	52%	50%	58%
Somewhat support	18%	21%	15%	7%
Somewhat oppose	6%	6%	8%	6%
Strongly oppose	13%	12%	14%	18%
Change in Support \$40 Compared to \$15 (18)				
Strongly support	14%	11%	15%	28%
Somewhat support	-6%	-2%	-9%	-26%
Somewhat oppose	-5%	-5%	-8%	-3%
Strongly oppose	-4%	-5%	0%	0%
Support Measure to Preserve Clean Water, Open Space and Farm and Ranch Land if Cost were \$40/year (1)				
Strongly support	34%	35%	27%	19%
Somewhat support	28%	29%	34%	32%
Somewhat oppose	12%	11%	11%	13%
Strongly oppose	19%	18%	23%	32%
Support Measure to Preserve Clean Water, Open Space and Farm and Ranch Land if Cost were \$15/year (1)				
Strongly support	52%	52%	50%	51%
Somewhat support	20%	21%	29%	17%
Somewhat oppose	7%	6%	6%	4%
Strongly oppose	15%	16%	11%	23%
Change in Support \$40 Compared to \$15 (1)				
Strongly support	18%	17%	23%	32%
Somewhat support	-8%	-8%	-5%	-15%
Somewhat oppose	-5%	-5%	-5%	-9%
Strongly oppose	-4%	-2%	-12%	-9%
(1) BAOSC (Nov 2000) sample size:	900	651	70	47
(18) Audubon (2000) sample size:	700	420	91	56

(1) BAOSC (Nov 2000) sample size:

(18) Audubon (2000) sample size:

VI. Findings and Recommendations

BUILD FROM COMMON GOALS

People of color have limited involvement in land and water conservation at the professional, managerial and advocacy level. There are also differences in recreational interests and participation rates by ethnicity. Whites do appear to be more interested in hiking a trail as an end in and of itself. Other groups, particularly Latinos, do show somewhat greater interest in family-oriented activities, including picnics and games.

Nonetheless, the main message of the studies and surveys discussed here is the overwhelming similarities across ethnic lines. Expressed values about parks, habitat and open space have a lot in common. These commonly-shared goals provide a strong foundation for diversifying the environmental community.

When it comes to believing it is important to preserve nature, acquire regional open space for recreation and habitat, and provide more and better urban parks close to home, support by all ethnic groups is high, and outlooks are more similar than different. This suggests that diversifying the leadership and management of the land and water conservation community requires new approaches, but does not depend on changes in fundamental values.

Recommendation One: The Bay Area Open Space Council and its members should continue and expand efforts to diversify their programs, staff and leadership. This is critical to the development of the next generation of leaders and a strong base of support for conservation. Fortunately, there is high potential for success because many core values are held in common.

BALANCE RESOURCE PROTECTION AND RECREATIONAL INVESTMENTS

The approval of three large park and resource bond in recent years in California has triggered a fair amount of debate about expenditure priorities and environmental justice. Much of the debate has been over the degree to which state bond funds should be geared toward urban park and recreation needs close to home, to regional parks, to habitat preservation and to open space and farmland protection.

From the standpoint of physical use and enjoyment, parks close to home do get more use. From an environmental justice perspective, neighborhood and recreation-oriented parks and trails should be distributed as evenly as possible by geography and community. The studies considered here do not answer the question of whether all people have equitable access to parks.

On the other hand, protection of habitat and natural resources must of necessity take place where the habitat and resources are found. Given the strong support expressed by all ethnic groups for protecting habitat and natural resources, it makes sense to continue to invest resource protection funding wherever those resources are found, irrespective of distribution or demographic factors.

On balance, the surveys and studies covered in this report suggest a mix of purposes and investments is appropriate.

Recommendation Two: The Bay Area Open Space Council should continue to support multipurpose park and open space funding measures.

Recommendation Three: The Bay Area Open Space Council should evaluate the distribution of neighborhood serving parks and determine whether all neighborhoods (and by association all ethnic groups) have a fair and sufficient share of parks and services.

EVALUATE POTENTIAL TO MEET MULTIPLE PURPOSES SIMULTANEOUSLY

Many protected open space lands already serve multiple purposes. However, there may well be opportunities for serving a broader constituency of users, in ways that are compatible with resource protection goals.

For example, current trailhead design often only serves serious hikers: a parking lot, maybe a brief information kiosk, and then one or more trails. Such a design doesn't well serve families with younger children. Adding a picnic area at the trailhead might help. Adding a short nature trail with good informational materials might get some of the families and their kids into the woods and learning something about nature.

As another example, most public campgrounds are primarily geared to small groups (a few friends, or one or two nuclear families). Resource impacts are restricted by limiting the number of camp sites. This approach doesn't work well for extended family and community gatherings. Group campsite policies and outreach efforts seem to work best for organized groups such as the Boy Scouts or Girl Scouts. An evaluation of campground designs and reservation policies could reveal opportunities to better serve extended families and other larger informal gatherings while still providing appropriate resource protection and maintaining peace and quiet for other users.

Recommendation Four: Members of the Bay Area Open Space Council should audit their existing parks to evaluate whether there are additional opportunities for providing multiple compatible benefits that would appeal to more people, and respond to the differences in recreational behavior that are expressed by different ethnic groups.

Recommendation Five: When purchasing new park and open space lands, management plans should be developed that consider not just natural resources but also how development and access policies can be designed to benefit the full diversity of the Bay Area.

Of course, different types of agencies and organizations have different missions. It is neither practical nor appropriate to suggest that each agency and land management organization meet all the park, trail, habitat and farmland protection needs of their area.

By working in partnership with other agencies and organizations in the region, however, it should be possible to maintain individual missions while capturing the broadest possible level of support. Both urban park providers and preservers of open space benefit when their purposes are joined in the public mind.

Recommendation Six. The Bay Area Open Space Council and its members should explore options for increasing the public's understanding of how different park and conservation purposes are linked, and the perception that a range of urban and regional agencies and organizations are working cooperatively.

EMPHASIZE PURPOSES, NOT PROCESS

Comparisons of different surveys using different terminology

demonstrates the importance of language. In particular, support for land and water conservation is highest when these are described in terms of purposes. It is more effective to talk about preserving wildlife and fish by acquiring open space, than it is to just talk about acquiring open space.

Resource linkages, such as between watershed protection and water quality, or between open space and wildlife, appear to be somewhat more implicitly understood and valued by white respondents than others. Even so, support from all groups is enhanced when the reasons for parks and open space are made explicit.

Some purposes appear to resonate differently with different ethnic group. For example, linking good science to conservation seems to be especially important for Asian American respondents. Family recreation and providing places for kids to play and learn are especially valued by Latino respondents. Providing places for dog walking does not appear to be a major consideration except for white, and to a lesser extent Asian American respondents.

Still, it is important to emphasize that while some message targetting to different ethnic groups may be effective and appropriate, the common conservation and recreational values shared by all ethnic groups are more dominant than the differences. The first and most critical challenge is to ensure effective use of language to express these common values.

Recommendation Seven: Park and open space agencies and organizations should evaluate their media, educational and other outreach materials to ensure they consistently frame content in terms of conservation and recreation purposes, and not just the actions which are undertaken or contemplated.

EXPAND USE OF LANGUAGES OTHER THAN ENGLISH

Very little information put out by park and open space agencies and organizations is available in any language other than English. Translating trailhead information, maps and other educational materials into other languages, and especially Spanish, would undoubtedly have some effect in increasing park usage and natural resource knowledge. In addition, a conscious effort of outreach to non-English speaking TV, radio and newspapers would have payoffs. Most media coverage is determined by the easy availability of information. If press releases and film clips are only available in English, Spanish TV is much less likely to cover the story.

The internet has also become a widely used resource by all segments of society, and its use will only grow further. Very little Bay Area park, recreation and open space information is currently made available on the internet in any language but English.

Recommendation Eight: Park agencies and land conservation organizations should audit their outreach and education programs to determine how to better reach non-English speaking residents and park users, including appropriate languages and both passive and active forms of distribution.

PARTNER WITH LOCAL GROUPS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Another area with great potential for strengthening participation and active involvement by people of color is to develop more extensive partnerships with local groups and organizations. Whites report at much higher rates than others that they receive

environmental information from organizations to which they belong. Since information derived from organizations to which one belongs is more likely to be paid attention to and believed, park agencies and land conservation organizations should review and where possible expand the audiences which receive their news and information to include more organizations associated with people of color.

In addition to broadening the distribution of their own materials, park agencies and land conservation organizations should continue and expand the practice of encouraging community based organizations and churches to include information in their publications and outreach materials.

Most park agencies allow community groups to make reservations for park facilities for group and community functions. However, allowing something to happen is not the same as encouraging and facilitating it. Some park agencies have active outreach and partnership building programs, and others do not.

The key to partnerships is to open a dialogue with potential partners to determine what they want. Every situation and every partner is different.

Recommendation Nine: Park agencies and land conservation organizations should work with potential partners to audit their operations and management procedures and policies to evaluate whether they support or hinder volunteer and partnership opportunities, and to identify additional partnership opportunities.

Schools offer obvious partnership opportunities for educating the public and developing future leaders. To be most effective, educational materials must be aligned with evolving State curriculum standards. In addition, the focus should be on activities and materials that involve entire families, not just students.

Recommendation Ten: Park agencies and land conservation organizations should continue to seek additional funding and develop additional educational programming and state curriculum-linked educational materials in partnership with local schools, particularly programs that involve parents as well as students.

MAKE CONTENT AND IMAGERY CULTURALLY APPROPRIATE

Nearly all people respond positively when their interests are acknowledged and their experiences respected. Combine this rather obvious observation about human nature with the marketing concept of branding, and it becomes readily apparent that park agencies and land conservation organizations have a tremendous opportunity.

How many agency and organization logos involves any imagery or symbolism reflective of the region's latino, African American, Asian American or Native American heritage? Almost none. How many parks are named and branded in ways that reflect or appeal to the diversity of cultures now found in the area? A few. Opportunities for branding are numerous: park maps and brochures, signs, place names, logos, and the content of outreach materials.

The most effective way to develop culturally appropriate content and imagery is to develop partnerships with local artists, cultural centers and community and school groups.

Recommendation Eleven: Park agencies and land conservation organizations should work with potential partners to evaluate their current operations and identify opportunities for appropriate product branding that acknowledges and celebrates the cultural diversity of the region and its connections to the natural world.

Bibliography

- (1) Bay Area Open Space Council (Nov 2000). "Bay Area Open Space Survey, prepared by Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates.
- (2) California Department of Parks and Recreation (Dec 2003). "Public Opinions and Attitudes on Outdoor Recreation in California 2002: An Element of the California Outdoor Recreation Plan.
- (2a) California Department of Parks and Recreation (1993-2004). "Comment cards submitted by state park users", unpublished data.
- (3) Dunn, Robert A. (1998). "African-American Recreation at Two Corps of Engineers Projects: A Preliminary Assessment", Natural Resources Technical Note REC-10, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- (4) Dunn, Robert A. (1998). "Native American Recreation at Corps Projects: Results of Six Focus Groups", Natural Resources Technical Note REC-09, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.
- (5) Dunn, Robert A. (1999). "Hispanic-American recreation at two Corps lakes in Texas and California: A preliminary assessment," Natural Resources Technical Note REC-11, U.S. Army Engineer Research and Development Center, Vicksburg, MS.
- (6) Dwyer, J.F. (1994). "Customer diversity and the future demand for outdoor recreation," General Technical Report RM-22, USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Forest and Range Experiment Station, Fort Collins, CO.
- (7) East Bay Regional Park District. (1998-2003) Longitudinal monitoring surveys of park users.
- (8) East Bay Regional Park District, (January 2001) "Park User Loyalty/Satisfaction Research". Prepared by Strategy Research Institute.
- (9) East Bay Regional Park District (May 2001). "Benchmarks for March 2002 Elections: Environmental Maintenance Tax Initiative and Renewal of Measure AA, prepared by Strategy Research Institute.
- (10) East Bay Regional Park District (June/July 2004). "Environmental Maintenance Tax Measure Zone 1 Voter Survey". Prepared by Research and Consulting for Strategic Planning.
- (11) East Bay Regional Park District (June 2004). EBRPD Zone One Survey. Prepared by Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin & Associates. Survey conducted June 29-July 1.
- (12) Floyd, Myron F (2001). "Managing National Parks in a Multicultural Society: Searching for Common Ground", *Managing Recreational Use*, V18, N3, pp41-51.
- (13) Frey, W.H. (1998). "The diversity myth," *American Demographics* 6/98, 39-43
- (14) Gramann, J.H., M.F. Floyd and R. Saenz (1993). "Outdoor Recreation and Mexican American Ethnicity: A Benefits

Perspective.” In Ewert, A.W., D.J. Chavez, and A.W. Magill, eds. *Conflict and Communication in the Wildland-Urban Interface*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

(15) Gramann, J.H. (1996). “Ethnicity, race, and outdoor recreation: A review of trends, policy, and research,” Miscellaneous Paper R-96-1, U.S. Army Engineer Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, MS.

(16) Johnson, Cassandra Y., J.M. Bowker, D.B.K. English, and Dreamal Worthen (1997). “Theoretical perspectives of ethnicity and outdoor recreation: a review and synthesis of African-American and European-American participation,” General Technical Report SRS-11, Asheville, NC: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Research Station. 16 p.

(17) Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District (1994). Voter Survey. Prepared by J. Moore Methods.

(18) National Audubon Society (Oct 2000). Bay Area Survey. Prepared by Fairbank, Maslin, Maullin and Associates.

(19) Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. “National Survey on Recreation and the Environment 2000-2003. Versions 1-15

(20) Public Policy Institute of California (2002). “PPIC Statewide Survey: Special Survey on Californians and the Environment”.

(21) Public Policy Institute of California (2000). “PPIC Statewide Survey: Special Survey on Californians and the Environment”.

(22) Santa Clara County (2001), “Survey of Residents”, prepared by Evans/McDonough Company

(23) Solop, Frederic I., Hagen, Kristi K., and Osergren, David (2003). “The National Park Service comprehensive survey of the American public: Ethnic and racial diversity of National Park System Visitors and Non-Visitors.

(24) Scott, David, and Chulwon Kim (1998). “Outdoor Recreation Participation and Barriers to Involvement”, Technical Report submitted to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

(25) State of California, Department of Finance, “Population projections by race/ethnicity for California and its Counties 2000-2050”, Sacramento, CA, May 2004

(26) Trust for Public Land, “No place to play: A comparative analysis of park access in seven major cities”, San Francisco, CA, 2003?

(27) West, P.C. (1993). “The tyranny of metaphor: Interracial relations, minority recreation, and the wildland-urban interface.” *Culture, conflict, and communication in the wildland-urban interface*. A.W. Ewert, D.J. Chavez, and A.W. Magill, ed., Westview Press, Boulder, CO, 109-15.

(28) National Park Service, (2003) Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area: Recreational Trail Use Survey”, prepared by the USC Center for Sustainable Cities.

(29) Bay Area Open Space Council (2003-4), Survey of Park Users. (see appendix)

(30) Bay Area Open Space Council (2004), Pinole Regional Park Observations. (see appendix)

(31) Bay Area Open Space Council (2004), Redwood Regional Park Observations. (see appendix)

Appendices

A.	BAOSC (2003-4) Park User Survey Results	51
B.	Observations of Three Sonoma County Parks	55
C.	Observations of Two Napa County Parks	59
D.	Observations of Three East Bay Parks	63
E.	National Survey on Recreation and the Environment--Bay Area Results	67

A. Bay Area Park User Survey Results

During the summer of 2003 the Bay Area Open Space Council conducted brief interviews with park users around the San Francisco Bay Area. Additional interviews were conducted in the summer of 2004. A total of 283 interviews were completed.

The methodology used in selecting parks and people to interview was not intended to provide a statistically random sample, but rather to ensure a diversity of park types and locations, and a diversity of park users.

The parks included in this survey were initially selected at random from the Council's database of publicly-accessible protected open space lands in the region. This random selection did not result in the inclusion of a full range of park types and activities. As a result, a few more parks were added.

Interviews were conducted by a bilingual (English and Spanish) interviewer. Those interviewed were selected as randomly as possible, but there was undoubtedly some bias in terms of who was interviewed. Some categories of people are more likely to be willing or available than others to be interviewed. For example, since the interviewer was male, male park users may have been more willing to be approached and interviewed than were female park users. Thus, the fact that more men than women were surveyed should not be interpreted to mean that men are more likely than women to be park users. Indeed, other surveys based on interviews with randomly-selected

members of the general public suggest that overall park usage rates are similar for men and women. No attempt has been made to weight the results to correct for potential over or under selection.

Because of this methodology, results from this survey can be used to evaluate similarities and differences in activity preferences and attitudes associated with various demographic factors. However, the results cannot be used to evaluate whether any given demographic group uses parks more or less than another.

To provide some insight into this latter question, a series of qualitative and quantitative observations were conducted at selected parks. Parks were selected to allow comparisons of different types of parks. In Sonoma County, a highly developed city park, a county-run park and campground and a minimally-developed State Park, all in close physical proximity, were compared. In Napa County, a highly developed urban park was compared to a nearby park on the edge of town with some facilities and improvements and a focus on recreational activities including mountain biking, hiking, and archery. In the East Bay three regional parks were selected: one next to a highly diverse population in Western Contra Costa County, one next to an affluent Oakland neighborhood but within a few miles of a very diverse population, and one in a more remote location where nearly all users must drive half an hour or more. The results of these observations are provided in Appendices B, C and D.

Bay Area Open Space Council

Park User Survey

Conducted 2003-2004

	<u>Total</u>		<u>Percent of Respondents</u>									
			<u>Gender</u>		<u>Age</u>			<u>Ethnicity</u>				
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u><=25</u>	<u>26-50</u>	<u>=>51</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Latino</u>	<u>African American</u>	<u>Asian American</u>	<u>Other</u>
What are your main reasons for being here today?												
a. Family gathering	78	28%	22%	35%	28%	28%	25%	27%	33%	29%	22%	13%
b. Exercise	85	30%	38%	18%	22%	31%	32%	26%	35%	14%	31%	44%
c. Recreation	116	41%	46%	33%	56%	42%	14%	33%	51%	14%	50%	50%
d. Solitude/enjoying time	64	23%	27%	16%	38%	21%	18%	26%	12%	36%	33%	25%
e. Bring kids to play	77	27%	20%	38%	0%	30%	36%	28%	36%	21%	14%	6%
How many people did you come with?												
a. Alone	68	24%	34%	10%	16%	25%	25%	21%	20%	21%	31%	63%
b. 1-2 people	61	22%	24%	19%	38%	18%	32%	29%	17%	21%	14%	6%
c. 2-5 people	121	43%	31%	60%	41%	44%	36%	42%	48%	29%	47%	25%
d. >5 people	33	12%	12%	12%	6%	13%	7%	9%	15%	29%	8%	6%
How often do you visit this park?												
a. First time	22	8%	6%	11%	19%	7%	4%	13%	4%	0%	3%	6%
b. 2-6 times/year	73	26%	25%	27%	22%	26%	32%	26%	22%	57%	31%	6%
c. 7-11 times/year	29	10%	11%	9%	9%	11%	4%	10%	10%	14%	8%	13%
d. Once a month	6	2%	1%	4%	0%	3%	0%	2%	2%	7%	3%	0%
e. Twice a month	27	10%	12%	5%	6%	10%	7%	6%	11%	7%	22%	0%
f. More than twice a month	126	45%	45%	44%	44%	43%	54%	42%	51%	14%	33%	75%
How often do you visit a park in general:												
a. First time	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
b. 2-6 times/year	24	8%	5%	13%	13%	7%	18%	11%	4%	21%	8%	0%
c. 7-11 times/year	15	5%	6%	4%	6%	5%	7%	5%	4%	7%	6%	13%
d. Once a month	11	4%	3%	5%	3%	4%	4%	4%	4%	7%	3%	0%
e. Twice a month	37	13%	15%	10%	6%	14%	14%	18%	5%	43%	11%	0%
f. More than twice a month	196	69%	70%	68%	72%	70%	57%	62%	82%	21%	72%	88%

Park User Survey (continued)

	<u>Total</u>		<u>Percent of Respondents</u>										
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Gender</u>		<u>Age</u>			<u>Ethnicity</u>					
			<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u><=25</u>	<u>26-50</u>	<u>>=51</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Latino</u>	<u>African American</u>	<u>Asian American</u>	<u>Other</u>	
In general, what types of activities do you take part in while at this park?													
a. Swimming	40	14%	13%	16%	25%	14%	4%	10%	12%	36%	22%	19%	
b. Hiking	46	16%	16%	17%	6%	19%	4%	22%	9%	7%	22%	13%	
c. Camping	24	8%	8%	10%	3%	10%	4%	13%	7%	7%	3%	0%	
d. Horseback riding	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	
e. Biking	30	11%	12%	9%	0%	12%	11%	12%	10%	0%	8%	19%	
f. Passive relaxation	119	42%	42%	42%	50%	42%	32%	39%	41%	36%	47%	63%	
g. Bird watching	15	5%	5%	5%	0%	6%	4%	7%	1%	7%	3%	19%	
h. Fishing	14	5%	8%	1%	6%	5%	0%	3%	4%	14%	8%	6%	
i. Dog walking	52	18%	18%	19%	9%	22%	4%	34%	1%	7%	17%	6%	
j. Picnicking	170	60%	54%	70%	66%	61%	50%	54%	71%	79%	53%	44%	
k. Boating	10	4%	4%	4%	3%	4%	0%	3%	4%	0%	3%	6%	
l. Sports	83	29%	34%	22%	63%	26%	18%	18%	43%	7%	36%	38%	
m. Other	130	46%	36%	60%	31%	45%	71%	52%	41%	43%	31%	63%	
How far do you travel to reach the park?													
a. <1 mile	63	22%	21%	24%	28%	21%	29%	23%	22%	7%	31%	13%	
b. 1-5 miles	130	46%	48%	43%	41%	48%	39%	43%	52%	43%	33%	63%	
c. 6-10 miles	27	10%	9%	11%	3%	11%	7%	8%	7%	21%	14%	19%	
d. 11-20 miles	41	14%	16%	12%	16%	13%	21%	18%	13%	21%	8%	6%	
e. >21 miles	22	8%	6%	10%	13%	8%	4%	8%	7%	7%	14%	0%	
What are the things you value most about parks and open spaces that you use?													
a. Nature	232	82%	79%	87%	63%	86%	71%	91%	67%	64%	94%	81%	
b. Solitude	108	38%	45%	27%	25%	38%	57%	38%	37%	29%	39%	50%	
c. Tme with family	227	80%	74%	90%	53%	85%	75%	77%	90%	79%	78%	56%	
d. Time with friends	239	84%	82%	88%	91%	87%	54%	86%	86%	86%	86%	56%	
e. Recreation	247	87%	89%	85%	88%	90%	64%	86%	92%	79%	83%	88%	
f. Land protection	152	54%	50%	59%	38%	57%	50%	65%	39%	36%	56%	63%	
g. Water quality	110	39%	37%	42%	31%	41%	29%	42%	26%	36%	58%	44%	
h. Wildlife protection	150	53%	47%	62%	19%	59%	46%	65%	35%	50%	64%	44%	
l. Scenery	247	87%	87%	88%	66%	91%	86%	92%	83%	86%	89%	75%	
j. Place for children to play/playgrounds	221	78%	73%	86%	81%	78%	71%	71%	90%	64%	83%	63%	

Park User Survey (continued)

	<u>Total</u>		<u>Percent of Respondents</u>									
			<u>Gender</u>		<u>Age</u>			<u>Ethnicity</u>				
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u><=25</u>	<u>26-50</u>	<u>>=51</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Latino</u>	<u>African American</u>	<u>Asian American</u>	<u>Other</u>
How did you find out about this park?												
a. Friend/family member	106	37%	37%	38%	38%	39%	26%	27%	47%	43%	39%	56%
b. Newspaper	1	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	0%
c. TV/radio	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
d. Guidebook	0	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
e. Internet	5	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	0%	2%	3%	0%	0%	0%
f. Saw the park	164	58%	58%	58%	56%	56%	74%	69%	47%	57%	56%	44%
g. Street/city map	5	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%	0%	1%	2%	0%	6%	0%
h. Map provided by park agency	2	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%
Total Number of Repondents	283		170	113	32	223	28	125	92	14	36	16

B. Three Sonoma County Parks

On the east side of Santa Rosa, three adjoining parks allow a hiker to walk from nearby neighborhoods to a wilderness in less than five miles. One, Howarth Park, is managed by the City of Santa Rosa; one, Spring Lake Park, by the Sonoma County Regional Parks Department and the third, is Annadel State Park. Each of these parks, though in close proximity to one another, offers quite unique recreational experiences. In combination, they provide a perfect lense from which to view park use absent the variables of distance to travel and proximity to specific communities and ethnic populations. Visitor activity was observed on a weekend summer afternoon, paying particular attention to contrasting uses and visitor characteristics.

Howarth Park

Howarth Park is one of the busiest and most popular parks in Santa Rosa with over 150 acres devoted to family oriented recreation. Situated among large old oak and eucalyptus trees, the park offers a range of activities and facilities including baseball fields, tennis courts and miles of trails leading to Spring Lake and Annadel. Children flock to the park with their parents to enjoy pony rides, a train that makes a short loop through the park, paddleboat rides on the lake, climbing structures, and even a carousel. Fishing and sailing are also popular at the lake, and a few large picnic areas provide space for family gathering and celebrations. There is a small concession stand that sells refreshments and 3 permanent restroom facilities.

Observations

Howarth Park is located across the street from several blocks of middle-income apartment buildings. Down the street a short distance are a theatre and a couple of restaurants. Farther up the road, toward Spring Lake Park, are more affluent, single family homes. However, the great majority of visitors on the summer day observed came by car. The parking lot was full and most of nearby street parking occupied as well. Several cars appeared to be circling, looking for parking.

Not surprisingly, families with children appear to be the main visitor group at the Park. At the playground area, several kids climbed a large jungle gym – most white children, one Latino family, and two African American children. In a nearby large grassy area, several groups and individuals are relaxing and picnicking on blankets. There are lines for the pony and train rides. At the train, 1 Latina mom with 5 kids waits in line, also four African American youth – ages maybe 7 to 15 (siblings?), a white mom with 2 kids, a couple with a toddler, and three adults. Teenagers dressed in matching park t-shirts work in various locations, apparently as some part of a summer work program. The large majority of children on the train, ponies and carousel are under the age of 10. In a large group picnic area with 10 tables, a birthday party is in full swing, including adults and children (white). Nearby, a Latino man seems to be reserving a picnic space by himself has set up a baby shower sign. In another picnic area, three tables are occupied by white families and a fourth

by a Phillipino family. Rented paddleboats dot the lake but no swimming is allowed.

Spring Lake Regional Park

This 320 acre regional park is owned by the Sonoma County Water Agency. It is open for day use year round and for camping during the summer months. The summer entrance day use fee is \$5; camping is \$17 per night. Many miles of hiking trails connect with trails in the adjacent Howarth City Park and Annadel State Park, as well the Bay Area Ridge Trail. A total 29 campsites are available and one large group campsite. The campground has restrooms and showers and RV sites. The beautiful Spring Lake is open all year for non-motorized boating. Canoes and paddleboats can be rented from April through September. While swimming is not allowed in the lake, a lagoon is available for swimming during the summer months. Lifeguards supervise the area, which is complete with a sandy beach and a nearby concessions stand with refreshments and inner tube rentals. Visitor also can fish at the lake and paved and dirt trails attract bicyclists and horseback riders. Nearly 200 picnic tables with barbeques are located throughout the park. The park also offers an 18-station par course for exercise enthusiasts. A former visitor center is now the 'Sonoma County Environmental Discovery Center.' The Center's mission is to "create a place where people of all ages learn the value of environmental stewardship, habitat restoration, parks, open space, and responsible use of Sonoma County's natural resources."

Observations

On a summer weekend afternoon, the camping area appeared almost full, mostly tent camping. A family rode by on bikes through the campground. At the lake, an Asian family, mom and dad and a kid, fished at the dock and a number of kayaks and canoes could be seen

far out on the water. A white middle-aged woman kayaked closer into shore. Two Hispanic young men pushed an elderly man in a wheelchair on the road by the lake. At the big picnic area on the other side of the lake, about 5 families are picnicking and swimming in the nearby lagoon, mostly white but one Latino family. This park is much more low key than Howarth and not nearly at capacity for day use. The parking lot is about half full.

Annadel State Park

Though only minutes from Santa Rosa, Annadel State Park is a vast undeveloped oak woodland of over 5,000 acres. Annadel has a very understated entrance. There is a self-pay "iron ranger" and a pocket-sized visitor center (not always open). Annadel's landscape covers steep terrain, with oak woodland interspersed with Douglas Fir, chaparral, streams and meadows. Abundant wildlife, including deer, coyote and many bird species are found throughout the park. The trail system is extensive (with seven named trails) and travels through a range of plant communities. Lake Ilsanjo offers ample fishing opportunities and is a popular destination for hikers. There is no camping at the park, which closes at sunset. Parking past the "Fee Area" sign requires a \$2 permit, but many users park their vehicles on the gravel turnout just before the sign. The main parking lot has two portapotties.

Observations

In the mid-afternoon on a warm sunny weekend day, driving into Annadel feels like discovering a remote private landscape rather than a State Park. A few cars with bicycle racks are parked in the gravel turnout. The "Fee Area" sign gives a clue that this is indeed a State Park. A mountain biker rides by. Further on, another small parking lot where most of the trailheads are has four cars. Only an old faded interpretive sign is visible from the lot. A horse trailer is

also parked here. Eight mountain bikers zip by during the time it takes to hike half a mile up the trail. One hiker, an elderly white man, comes down the trail. Most of the bikers are riding alone, except for two teenage white boys riding up the trail. Leaving the park, two road bikers pass on the paved road leading into the park.

At this time of year, due to its wild and rugged terrain, Annadel appeals mostly to fairly serious hikers and bikers. Heavier public use might occur with milder weather in the fall and spring. However, the striking contrast to the crowds at Howarth are very telling of the demand for parks with distinct amenities and recreational opportunities..

C. Two Napa Parks

Two parks in and near the City of Napa offer a good comparison of how park usage differs based on park amenities and character. Fuller Park is an historic urban park with a full range of amenities. Just a few miles away, Skyline Park is a regional park with a variety of park improvements in a more wilderness setting. Usage levels and the demographics of use are dramatically different.

Fuller Park: Napa, CA

History

Fuller Park is located in the downtown of the City of Napa and is part of the Fuller Park Historic District, a neighborhood designated under the National Registry of Historic Preservation. The ten-acre park was acquired in 1905 in order to provide playing fields for the city's football and baseball teams. Eventually the fields were replaced by traditional park landscaping giving rise to an impressive variety of trees and abundant grassy picnic areas. Over the years, several monuments and plaques were placed in the park as well as an historic water fountain, originally designed for horses. Fuller Park has become one of the city's most popular parks, known for its lovely setting and easy access to family neighborhoods.

Description

Today Fuller Park provides Napa residents with numerous recreation opportunities despite its relatively small size. In the early mornings, people can be seen jogging, walking, doing Tai Chi, and just sitting reading the paper with a cup of coffee. Later in the day,

kids appear with parents in tow to play on the colorful new playground equipment, completed only a year ago. Children ride their bikes on the paved walkway through the park, while grown-ups sneak catnaps under a shady conifer. In the good weather months, weekends at Fuller Park take on the rich flavor of a Mexican Zocalo – a park in the center of most towns in Central and South America where people gather to socialize and be seen. Large gatherings, mostly Latinos, celebrate birthdays, baptisms, baby showers, etc. with barbeques, balloons, piñatas, plenty of food and sometimes music. Single Latino men stroll through the park, dressed in traditional attire, flare pants, big belt buckles and white cowboy hats. You can even buy helados (ice cream and Popsicles) from a little Mexican cart pulled around by a young Latino who often ventures into the surrounding neighborhoods, ringing the little bell now familiar to kids, Latino and white alike.

Facilities

Fuller Park's facilities and grounds are well maintained and while usually adequate can be in big demand on summer weekends. The Park has 20 picnic tables scattered throughout the grassy areas. Three multi-table picnic sites with standing barbeques can be reserved ahead of time for a fee when groups are 15 or larger. Permanent restrooms are located in the center of the park, near the playground. Playground areas include two structures, one for older kids and one for younger kids, youth and toddler swings and slides, as well as sand to play in and benches to sit on. The Park also has a Bocce Ball court and a horseshoe site that seem to get minimal use. A small rose garden provides a sunny and colorful respite to the otherwise shady park. Water fountains can be found near the

restrooms and play areas. A Headstart building with its own play structure sits in one corner of the park, fenced off from the public. The reserved group picnic sites are normally all taken on holiday weekends and most summer weekend days.

While Fuller Park is a neighborhood park and certainly many people arrive on bike and foot, for weekend use connected to celebrations, many use cars to transport food and party loads. There is no parking lot but street parking around the perimeter of the park is usually quite full on summer weekends.

Observations

On a warm day in the afternoon, near the middle of June, preparations for parties are taking place in the 3 group picnic areas, two birthday parties and one baby shower. There are balloons and streamers, and at one site kids are hanging up a piñata. Food is being laid out and the coals have been lit in the grills. In a nearby area, three elderly Latino men sit at a table talking; at another, Latino teenagers, mostly boys seem to just sit and watch as people enjoy the day. The helado cart comes by, stops and its owner speaks Spanish to a boy fishing in his pockets for change. Away from the party commotion, a young woman, white, sits at a picnic table studying, a college student perhaps. An older Latino gentlemen walks along the winding path alone, his large white cowboy hat covering part of his face. The activity level rises at the playground where over a dozen children are engaged in climbing, sliding, swinging and sandplay. Most of the kids are under 5, a few between 5 and 10 – some Asian, some Latino, and some white. Parents observe nearby on benches. A few grandparents accompany children.

Away from the playground, the park caters to the whims of people in many shapes and sizes and colors. A young white couple sits under a tree on the grass reading together. A middle-aged Latino

male rides by on a bike with headphones on. In a smaller picnic site with two tables, a white family is celebrating a birthday, complete with decorations and a barbeque hauled from home. A jogger, Latino, moves through a corner of the park, right past a teenager sprawled out on the grass, content with headphones. A woman lies on a blanket reading; a homeless looking white man with a plastic bag naps under a tree. A Latino teenager talks on a cell phone, eating an ice-cream bar. A dad and 2-year old daughter, Asian, sit and eat ice cream – the ice cream man has made his way around the park! Humming by on an electric wheelchair, a man nods at those he passes. A young white couple plays croquet, while nearby a Latina mom and daughter are giggling on a blanket in the shade. Three Latino boys play baseball, their families at the adjacent picnic area preparing food. Away from the picnickers, a young Latino naps in the deep shade, his hat lying next to him. But not all are playing or resting – a busy and boisterous group of men and women with a few children are seated at a table, shelling fresh garbanzo beans purchased at the local flea market.

Comments

Fuller Park provides the Napa community with a small but lovely landscaped urban park with just enough facilities to satisfy user needs for daily and weekend close-to-home recreation opportunities. The multi-cultural nature of park use reflects the population of downtown Napa. While the immediate surrounding historic area has expensive older homes, within a few blocks are apartment buildings with mostly Latino residents. Daily use of the playground area seems to be a mix of people, but Latino families dominate the picnic celebrations on the weekends. This can most likely be attributed to a cultural preference for such celebrations as well as the possibility that these people's home are not large enough to hold big parties. Kennedy Park, a larger city park, is a farther drive from the town of Napa and receives similar weekend use. Comparable amenities and facilities suggest that these account for

such use rather than proximity to neighborhoods. Skyline Park, on the other hand, a regional wilderness park, receives much less weekend picnic use by the Latino community.

Skyline Wilderness Park, Napa, CA

History

Originally part of property belonging to Napa State Hospital, Skyline Park is located in the southern part of Napa County on the edge of the City of Napa. These lands were used for many years by the Hospital to farm and ranch while the lake provided a source of water for hospital patients. However, in the late 70's, the Hospital determined that the lands were no longer needed and proposed to put the acreage on the market. A citizens group formed to advocate for the area to be designated parkland, led primarily by local equestrian interests. After considerable lobbying and negotiation, the State leased the land to Napa County, which then subleased it to the Skyline Park Citizens Association. Bond monies were used for initial fence construction, parking areas, an entry kiosk, sewer system and bathrooms. The Park officially opened on April 5, 1983. Over the years, the California Native Plant Society, the California Conservation Corps, the Audubon Society and many others have contributed to preserving and enhancing the region as a natural wilderness park.

Description

With over 850 acres, Skyline Park has extensive trails, over 25 miles, for hiking, biking and horseback riding. Lake Marie is a lovely natural lake, located two and a half miles by trail from the main parking area. An oak woodland habitat that includes some of the eastern hills of Napa County, the park hosts an abundance of

wildlife and birds, and spectacular views for those willing to climb to the top. San Pablo Bay, Mt. Tamalpais, and Mount St. Helena can be seen on clear days. While situated in the County rather than the City of Napa, middle-income neighborhoods are literally within walking distance, as are more affluent homes.

Locals come to Skyline Park year round for recreation as well as special events. Use tends to be dispersed given the large size of the park and the nature of activities that visitors engage in. The exceptions are the designated camping and RV areas, and picnic grounds that sometimes host large events such as children's camps as well as organization and club sponsored activities. Groups such as archery clubs, Boy and Girl Scouts, local schools, 4-H, and RV clubs sponsor events throughout the year. The National Civil War Association has had its "Civil War Days" at the park, lasting several days and drawing large numbers of spectators. The California Native Plant Society holds an annual plant sale and wildflower shows. Equestrian events are held regularly. In addition, Skyline has hosted Anachronism groups who re-create medieval life, and for many years there was an annual folk music festival. Bicycle clubs also use the park's extensive trail system; the park has hosted the World Bike Cup Race on three occasions.

Yet on an average weekend, when nothing special is going on, it is typical to see few cars in the parking lot and just a scattering of people hiking or bike riding on the trails.

Facilities

Although a "wilderness" park with most of its acres in natural habitat, the developed part of Skyline Park contains a variety of facilities for public use. The RV park has approximately 30 spaces with outlets and water hook-ups. Tent camping is also available with about 10 sites and nearby showers and restrooms. Near the camping area is a social center, a building for meetings and indoor

parties with capacity for 200 people. Weddings, memorial services, and crab feeds are among the building's uses. Also in this general vicinity, there are picnic and barbeque areas for family and larger groups, including an open-air activity center and cookhouse. This is where most camps and special events are centered. In the summer this area is shaded but dusty; there is no watered grass. The Bucky Stewart Memorial Arena lies on the west end of the park and is available for day use or special events by reservation. Thanks to the generosity of the California Native Plant Society, there is a lovely native plant garden called the Martha Walker Garden which is visited year round by school groups and locals. Archery on the NFAA range is available to the public on the 2nd Sunday of every month. There is also a disc golf course on a steep grassy hillside of the Park.

Observations

In mid-May, a local school hosted a community wide event entitled "Acorns to Oaks," a celebration of Napa's community and the earth. Planned for several months, the event had numerous performers – musicians, puppeteers, Mexican dancing, drummers, etc. There were also non-profit booths, vendors, food and many scheduled kids' activities. The event was free and started off with a fun run in the Park. The main activities were held in the picnic area.

On a warm sunny day in early June, a group of Boy Scouts and their families were camping out in the tent area of the park. Not exactly a wilderness experience, most families had driven less than 15 minutes from home. But camping is camping, and the boys seemed to be having a blast though disappointed that fires are restricted to the barbeques. Two other sets of campers also were there – one a middle-aged couple from out of state, the other a group of young adults. The picnic area was mostly deserted except for people walking or riding through on bikes. Mid-morning, less than 10 hikers headed up the hills as well as a handful of mountain bikers.

In mid-July on a Sunday late morning, Skyline Park is rather quiet. Some Hispanic men clean up from the previous night's party in the picnic area, but today there is no one here enjoying the cool morning. Two tents are set up in the camping area but the remaining sites are empty. The RV park is full however, but people seem to be off sightseeing for the day. Only a couple of people are seen outside among the quite large RVs parked side by side. Up the trail, there is a mountain biker heading into the backcountry, a young man originally from El Salvador, living in Vallejo. He says Skyline is a great place to mountain bike. On the same trail, a woman on horseback heads toward the Arena. But despite the perfect weather, the parking lot is less than a quarter full, about 10 cars.

Comments

According to park staff, Skyline Park does get considerable use by Napa's Latino community for special events, particularly rental of the social center. However, general picnic use on summer weekends is much less than the urban parks probably due to the setting – dry and dusty with lots of wasps – and lack of playground equipment. As a wilderness park, it serves different purposes, not only public enjoyment but open space and habitat protection. However, the special events held at the park and the community center seem to enhance the diversity of user groups. However, it can be safely said that the majority of dispersed recreational use – hiking and biking – does not include the Latino community for the most part.

D. Three East Bay Regional Parks

The East Bay has a wide variety of regional parks distributed throughout the two counties. Each park has its own particular ecology, history, and character. Three parks—all located in Western Contra Costa County in relatively close proximity—were selected for comparison purposes. These were Point Pinole Regional Park, Redwood Regional Park, and Briones Regional Park.

Point Pinole Regional Park

A 2,146 acre point thrusting north into San Pablo Bay, this regional park was home to four munitions manufacturing companies between 1880 and 1960. Raised earth berms, sunken former bunkers, and remnants of railroad ties are still visible reminders of that industrial

Point Pinole Regional Park Field Observations

Activity	Total	Ethnicity				Gender Other	Gender male	Age			
		White	African American	Asian American	Latino			female	under 18	18-60	over 60
Total cycling	11	3		1	7		6	5	6	5	0
Total dog walking	10	9		1			4	6		10	
Total fishing	13	1	2	4	6		10	2	3	10	
Total jogging	1			1			1		1		
Total sitting/reading	8	8					5	3			8
Total picnic	22	5	11	3	3	1	12	11	2	21	
Total walking	46	28	1	8	9	0	20	25	7	35	4
Total	112	54	14	18	25	1	58	54	19	81	12
Percent cycling	10%	6%	0%	6%	28%	0%	10%	9%	32%	6%	0%
Percent dog walking	9%	17%	0%	6%	0%	0%	7%	11%	0%	12%	0%
Percent fishing	12%	2%	14%	22%	24%	0%	17%	4%	16%	12%	0%
Percent jogging	1%	0%	0%	6%	0%	0%	2%	0%	5%	0%	0%
Percent sitting/reading	7%	15%	0%	0%	0%	0%	9%	6%	0%	0%	67%
Percent picnicking	20%	9%	79%	17%	12%	100%	21%	20%	11%	26%	0%
Percent walking	41%	52%	7%	44%	36%	0%	34%	46%	37%	43%	33%
Percent of total park users	100%	48%	13%	16%	22%	1%	52%	48%	17%	72%	11%

Source: BAOSC July 10, 2004

era. Shell fragments from earlier Native American habitation are also visible. However, nature has largely reclaimed the park: non-native yet shady Eucalyptus, grass meadows, marsh plants, and of course poison oak. Bay views from the westward facing bluffs are inspiring.

Notable attractions for this park are the fishing pier at the far northerly point, a paved path connecting the parking area in the south to numerous picnic areas and the fishing pier, opportunities

for shoreline exploration, and a network of flat walking trails, many with great views.

The park is adjacent to both old and new Richmond, areas of great poverty as well as upscale neighborhoods and Hilltop Mall. Ethnic diversity is high.

Point Pinole experiences moderate park usage by a highly diverse group of users. Of 98 visitors in a two-hour period on a summer

Redwood Regional Park Field Observations

Primary Activity	Total	Ethnicity				Gender		Age			
		White	African American	Asian American	Latino	Other	male	female	under 18	18-60	over 60
Total cycling	34	28	0	6	0	0	28	5	0	34	0
Total dog walking	63	53	0	6	1	3	29	34	8	54	2
Total hiking	52	49	0	1	0	2	23	29	5	36	11
Total horseback riding	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
Total jogging	21	17	1	0	2	1	7	17	2	18	1
Total sitting/reading	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Total picnic	6	0	0	0	0	6	4	2	3	2	1
Total walking	57	43	1	4	9	0	24	33	7	46	6
Total park users	236	193	2	17	12	12	115	123	25	193	21
Percent cycling	14%	15%	0%	35%	0%	0%	24%	4%	0%	18%	0%
Percent dog walking	27%	27%	0%	35%	8%	25%	25%	28%	32%	28%	10%
Percent hiking	22%	25%	0%	6%	0%	17%	20%	24%	20%	19%	52%
Percent horseback riding	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	1%	0%
Percent jogging	9%	9%	50%	0%	17%	8%	6%	14%	8%	9%	5%
Percent sitting/reading	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%
Percent picnic	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	50%	3%	2%	12%	1%	5%
Percent walking	24%	22%	50%	24%	75%	0%	21%	27%	28%	24%	29%
Percent of total park users	100%	82%	1%	7%	5%	5%	49%	52%	11%	82%	9%

Source: BAOSC, July 17, 2004 field observations

Saturday, 48% percent were white, 22% were Latino, 16% were Asian American, and 13% were African American. This mix is similar to the West Contra Costa population generally.

This is a good place for low intensity bicycling and strolling around. It's also a favorite park for larger groups, both because it is easy to get to and it is a good place for group picnics.

Walking is the most common activity. Since observations about likely uses were made at the entrance to the park, those classified as walking could also have been planning on a light picnic, quiet sitting, bird watching, and the like. Whites were most likely to fall

in this category (52%), though the majority of Asian Americans and Latinos were also there for such purposes. Whites were the least likely to be involved in fishing and large picnics. African Americans were overwhelmingly there for group picnics. Men and women used the park in equal frequency.

Redwood Regional Park

Redwood Regional Park straddles the high ground East of Oakland. Logged between 1840 and 1850, second growth redwoods have reclaimed much of the park, with the rest covered with Oaks, Bay Laurel, and chaparral. Trails run along two main ridges, through

Briones Regional Park

Park	Total	Ethnicity				Other	Gender		Age		
		White	African American	Asian American	Latino		male	female	under 18	18-60	over 60
Total cycling	7	5		2			6	1		7	
Total archery	4	4					3	1	1	3	
Total dog walking	5	5					3	2	2	3	
Total horseback riding	2	2						2		2	
Total picnic	2	2					1	1		2	
Total walking	12	11		1			7	5		12	
Total	32	29	0	3	0	0	20	12	3	29	0
Percent cycling	22%	17%	0%	67%	0%	0%	30%	8%	0%	24%	0%
Total archery	13%	14%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15%	8%	33%	10%	0%
Percent dog walking	16%	17%	0%	0%	0%	0%	15%	17%	67%	10%	0%
Total horseback riding	6%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	17%	0%	7%	0%
Total picnic	6%	7%	0%	0%	0%	0%	5%	8%	0%	7%	0%
Percent walking	38%	38%	0%	33%	0%	0%	35%	42%	0%	41%	0%
Percent of total park user	100%	91%	0%	9%	0%	0%	63%	38%	9%	91%	0%

Source: BAOSC July 10, 2004

the deep central canyon with a year-round stream, and lateral trails run up and down the canyon walls. The upper canyons and ridges are readily accessible from one main and several minor trailheads on Skyline Drive. The lower canyon, with watered lawns, picnic tables, play structures, a fee parking area, and staffed entrance kiosk, is a popular access point for group picnickers as well as walkers. While it remains relatively cool under the redwoods, the park is fairly hot and dry in the summer.

Redwood Regional Park receives a high level of usage. Dog walking, hiking and casual walking are the most popular activities, followed by cycling and jogging. Picnicking is also a very common, but much less so in the height of summer.

Park users here are much less diverse than at Point Pinole, not surprising given the blend of uses at the park. Of total park users, 82% were white. Use of the park by Asian Americans was similar (at 7%) to their share of the population in nearby Oakland. Use by Latinos was lower (5%), and use by African Americans was much lower (1%), than their relative share of the local population.

The serious hikers were nearly all white. Dog walkers were mostly white or Asian American. Most of the cyclists were white, though in percentage terms Asian Americans showed the most interest in the sport. Men and women used the park in equal frequency.

Briones Regional Park

Briones Regional Park is a large expanse of steep, grass covered hills that envelope most of the watershed above San Pablo Reservoir. The canyons are full of Oak and Bay Laurel, graced with seasonal streams. Cattle share the park with people in the winter and spring months when fresh grass is available. The park is generally hot and dry during the summer. Nearly all park visitors enter through the main gate at the western canyon mouth. An

extensive network of trails fans out from the parking lot. An archery range is located a short distance into the canyon; while other park users stop at the parking lot, archers are allowed to continue driving up the dirt road to the range.

Briones get moderate usage during the fall, winter and especially early spring months, when the grass is green, wildflowers are out in abundance, and the weather is cool. The closest residential areas to the main Briones entrance are 5 miles away in Tony Orinda; a drive from Oakland or Berkeley takes 20-30 minutes.

Nearly all park users are white. On the day of our survey, 91% were white, and the remaining 9% were Asian American. No Latinos or African Americans were observed. The most common uses were walking, cycling, dog walking, and archery. Two-thirds of the users were male, none were over 60 and the percentage of children was the lowest of the three parks.

E. Bay Area Outdoor Recreation Participation Rates

Higher Frequency Activities

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Sample Size</u>	<u>Percent Participating</u>				
		<u>White</u>	<u>Black Amer</u>	<u>Indian</u>	<u>Asian/PI</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
Bicycling	475	50	43	46	42	41
All Horseback Riding	109	13	13	8	3	6
Horseback Riding on Trails	84	11	10	9	4	4
Mountain Biking	249	30	21	30	25	24
Picnicking	648	68	61	46	60	57
Family Gathering	782	79	79	77	72	79
Walking for Pleasure	860	93	93	92	87	81
Hiking	554	61	21	46	41	55
Backpacking	183	22	4	0	15	10
Developed Camping	369	40	26	54	30	31
Primitive Camping	170	21	8	25	10	12
Wilderness Visit	436	50	24	39	29	29
Visit Farm/Ag setting	178	33	23	0	21	17
Driving for Pleasure	540	64	48	36	48	42
DrivIng Off-Road	138	15	12	88	16	15
All Fishing	224	23	20	31	16	25
All Freshwater Fishing	160	18	16	17	11	18
Coldwater Fishing	103	14	7	10	3	12
Warmwater Fishing	78	10	15	11	6	9
Saltwater Fishing	89	11	10	18	10	6
Anadromous Fishing	69	9	4	18	4	6
Motorboating	192	24	8	55	13	19
Swimming Outdoors	445	55	20	50	26	36
Snorkeling	124	17	2	9	6	12
Visit a Beach	586	67	44	50	54	53
Visit Waterside not a Beach	313	42	12	46	28	23

Bay Area Outdoor Recreation Participation Rates (continued)

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Sample Size</u>	<u>Perent Participating</u>				
		<u>White</u>	<u>Black</u>	<u>Amer Indian</u>	<u>Asian/PI</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
Downhill Skiing	155	19	12	33	23	10
Visit Nature Centers/Zoos	711	75	52	54	63	65
Visit Prehistoric Sites	226	25	22	17	21	22
Visit Historic Sites	545	69	47	60	46	41
Gather Mushrooms/Berries	219	25	11	8	10	14
View or Photograph Birds	341	39	23	46	26	19
View or Photograph Fish	227	25	14	46	10	21
View or Photograph Other Wildli	479	54	29	69	35	28
View or Photograph Wildflower	560	65	27	62	39	34
View or Photograph Natural Sc	724	79	42	62	69	57
Sightseeing	555	67	45	46	55	33

Lower Frequency Activities

All Hunting	35	4	2	8	0	1
Big Game Hunting	17	3	2	14	0	0
Small Game Hunting	16	2	2	0	0	0
Migratory Bird Hunting	9	1	0	0	0	0
Orienteering	2	1	0	0	0	5
Mountain Climbing	9	6	0	0	8	9
Rock Climbing	9	6	0	0	8	9
Yard games eg horseshoes	46	35	40	0	23	36
Outdoor Concerts	59	53	80	0	42	39
Gardening for pleasure	47	76	67	0	60	38
Sailing	86	12	2	46	1	6
Canoeing	77	10	2	0	1	8
Kayaking	80	12	0	0	4	3
Rowing	33	4	0	9	4	6

Bay Area Outdoor Recreation Participation Rates (continued)

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Sample Size</u>	<u>Perent Participating</u>				
		<u>White</u>	<u>Black Amer</u>	<u>Indian</u>	<u>Asian/PI</u>	<u>Hispanic</u>
Waterskiing	62	7	2	9	6	8
Jet Skiing	69	7	4	18	8	11
Rafting	89	11	0	18	8	11
Windsurfing	8	1	0	0	0	2
Surfing	36	5	0	0	6	3
Scuba Diving	30	4	2	9	3	1
Snowmobiling	29	3	4	33	3	1
Sledding	6	5	0	0	0	0
Snowshoeing	7	5	0	0	0	0
Snowboarding	79	9	8	0	9	11
Cross Country Skiing	53	7	0	0	5	3
Caving	10	7	0	0	0	14
Boat Tours or Excursions	41	35	60	100	0	14
Running or Jogging	57	39	40	100	46	46
Golf	26	19	20	0	23	23
Tennis Outdoors	21	16	0	0	31	5
Handball Outdoors	7	5	0	0	0	9
Inline Skating	14	16	50	0	29	0
Ice Skating Outdoors	8	8	20	0	0	0
Baseball	4	1	20	0	0	9
Softball	8	4	20	0	0	14
Football	7	3	20	0	0	14
Basketball	15	7	20	0	15	27
Soccer	10	3	20	0	15	18
Volleyball Outdoors	11	7	20	0	8	14
Attend Sports Event Outdoors	57	53	60	100	33	44

Source:

(19) National Survey on Recreation and the Environment 2000-2003